

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 386

CE 004 219

AUTHOR Crow, Stanley H., Ed.
TITLE Positions on the Practice of Vocational Evaluation: 1973; Vocational Evaluation Project--Year One.
INSTITUTION Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Rehabilitation Services Administration.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 104p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$5.70 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; *Evaluation Methods; Guidance Services; Handicapped; *Manpower Development; Occupational Guidance; *Rehabilitation Counseling; Skill Development; Vocational Adjustment; *Vocational Counseling; Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS Readings (Collections); *Vocational Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The collection of 17 position papers, submitted by coordinators and specialists in vocational education, is the product of a national seminar conducted during 1973, the first year of the vocational evaluation project. [Vocational evaluation has been defined as the process of assessing an individual's physical, mental, and emotional abilities, limitations, and tolerances in order to predict his current and future employment potential and adjustment. It is interdisciplinary and involves data from within and outside the total rehabilitation team.] A project overview introduces the articles. Four articles examine the role of the vocational evaluator: ideology and self-concept, task analyses, definitions of knowledge and skills, and training. Examining the evaluator's tools, five articles explore two evaluation methods: work samples and situational assessment. Also discussed are the evaluator as synthesizer and building new self-concepts in the client. Four articles on human dynamics concentrate on the relationships of the evaluator with the client, the counselor, other professionals, and the facility staff. Four articles focus on the delivery system: referral decisions, vocational evaluation in various milieus, active client involvement in rehabilitation, and the controversy over the validity and use of vocational evaluation. (JB)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

MAY 14 1975

POSITIONS ON THE PRACTICE OF VOCATIONAL EVALUATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 093 86

ED109386

PUBLISHED AS ONE VOLUME
JANUARY, 1975

Vocational Evaluation Project - Year One

POSITIONS ON THE PRACTICE OF VOCATIONAL EVALUATION

1973

Edited by Stanley H. Crow,
Project Director

Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association
1522 K Street N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20005

This project supported, in part,
by SRS Grant #12-P-55958/3-02 from
the Social and Rehabilitation Service,
Rehabilitation Services Administration.

THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

Table of Contents

SETTING THE CONTEXT	Pg
The Vocational Evaluation Project - Stanley H. Crow	1
THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR	
Self Story (Concept) - Charles S. Richman	5
A Task Analysis - Raymond A. Ehrle	12
Knowledge and Skills - Randall S. McDaniel	23
Training - Robert E. Mayes	26
THE EVALUATOR'S TOOLS	
Work Samples - Arnold Sax	30
Work Samples - Harold Kulman	37
Situational Assessment - Dennis J. Dunn	40
The Evaluator as the Synthesizer - Jack Genskow	45
Building New Self-Concepts in the Client - Thomas L. Brandon	51
HUMAN DYNAMICS	
The Client and the Evaluator - John J. Killian	57
Evaluator and Counselor - Robert M. Davis	61
The Evaluator and Other Professionals - Bernard Rosenberg	65
The Evaluator and the Facility Staff - Shirley Whipp	69
THE DELIVERY SYSTEM	
The Decision to Refer to Vocational Evaluation - Avis Peterson	73
Milieu Study - Horace Sawyer	77
Client Participation in Evaluation - B. Douglas Rice	81
The Validity and Use of Vocational Evaluation - Donn Brolin	85
COMPREHENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY	1

Setting the Context
THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

1.

"For almost half a century, a very large number of investigators and working professionals have committed a great deal of time and effort to the development of techniques designed to evaluate and predict work behavior." WALTER S. NEFF (1966)

1. Since the term "Pre-vocational Evaluation" first appeared, it has been implied that "Evaluation" is a specialized methodology belonging to a particular group of "professionals". "Vocational Evaluation", heir to the mantle, has continued in the same tradition. Research data has been collected to provide the background for curriculum development in the training of "professionals". Vocational Evaluation systems have been designed which would enable the "professional" evaluator to administer "evaluation" more efficiently to a larger group of "evaluatees". One senses, however, that the times are exerting a great pressure upon the field of evaluation. The emphasis upon consumer involvement, the rights of the consumer and the emphasis upon the client's "signing off" his own remediation plan, illuminate the indicative that research in evaluation must be done from the perspective of the client's needs, rather than the needs of the professional or of the delivery system.

2. The time has come for those of us who profess to possess these talents to seriously ask "Where have we come from?", "Where are we now?", and "Where are we going?". Even the most elementary survey of the field reveals that we share little in common among ourselves except vaguely defined terms, and a propensity to audaciously involve ourselves in the lives of other people who are seeking help. Our literature is full of contradictions, the turnover in the field appears to be high, and there is little concrete evidence that "Vocational Evaluation" and all of its borrowed methodology is worth the number of dollars being spent to purchase our services each year. Yet, the literature abounds with comments on the effectiveness of the evaluation process, and existentially you know, that for many individuals, it has been a significant turning point in their life's journey. The time has come for us to articulate the present evolutionary development of our field, and to create a vision of its increased effectiveness in the future.

I. SIGNIFICANT "EVALUATION" BENCHMARKS

3. Evaluation systems were created when it became obvious that psychometric and paper and pencil testing were not adequate for a portion of the population. Experimental sampling of jobs began on a somewhat organized basis following World War I, as noted in Bregman (1967), but the benchmark of vocational evaluation systems was the TOWER, developed by the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City in the late 1950's. It was the first systematic, individualized approach to vocational evaluation to be recognized across the country. As people came to see and learn about the system, there proliferated around the country a multitude of quasi-TOWER systems most of which did not have either the sophisticated development or criteria of the TOWER. Because these "do your own thing" systems have a lack of applicability from one center to another, there has been an obvious need for new systems, more universal in nature. The Philadelphia Jewish Employment and Vocational Serviced (JEVS) System, developed under contract with the Department of Labor was a serious attempt to create a comprehensive evaluation system which was applicable in a wide number of communities. Industry has also joined the task. (The Singer/Graflex Company created its own "package" system.)

4. The availability of data is as important as its original creation. Distribution and resource centers are key factors. "Work Evaluation in Rehabilitation"

2.

(an educational guide developed from an institute held in July 1969 in Denver, Colo.) was probable the first significantly recognized and accepted book in the field, although virtually half of the writing regarding vocational evaluation to date was done before its publication. In many respects, this book synthesizes much of the earlier writing and gave the field such gifts as Neff's (1966 and 1968) categories of evaluation (which today has a wide acceptance). It is significant that the mass distribution and reprinting of this book by the Materials Development Center (MDC) at the University of Wisconsin--Stout, contributed greatly to its acceptance. The publication of Work Evaluation--An Annotated Bibliography 1947 to 1970, also issued by MDC, was the vehicle which allowed the field to appropriate the previous writing. Significant in the development and distribution of material for the field has been the VEWAA Bulletin. Many other publications have also carried articles on evaluation including the Journal of Rehabilitation, Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, The American Journal of Occupational Therapy.

5. Research in the field of evaluation has been continually necessary for the creation of the many programs offered today, but that research data has not always been formally recorded. Basically, there are two types of research which have gone on in evaluation, 1) that necessary for the development of samples and systems and 2) that necessary to get an understanding of the practice of vocational evaluation itself. Eggerman's (1969) report on the Johnstown R & T Center's Study made in 1966 provided the first general picture of evaluators around the country. This was subsequently followed up by Sankowsky (1969) whose two studies in 1968 and 1969 drew their information from rehabilitation facilities (for the first study) and from the membership of the Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (for the second). The "Think Tank" at Stout State University in 1968 was also a significant attempt to draw together national attitudes from individuals well recognized in the field.

6. Training in the field of Vocational Evaluation has been, for most people, a period of apprenticeship. The first nationally offered training in evaluation was a series of classes held at the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled (ICD) in New York City to teach the use of the TOWER System, and the development of work samples. In the late 1960's Stout State University, University of Arizona, and Auburn University began to offer masters degree training in the field of evaluation, and shortly thereafter a number of universities began to offer short-term training sessions of one to four weeks on the subject. Today an evaluator may choose from a number of university programs, as well as specialized training programs, such as: ICD (the TOWER), the Philadelphia JEVS, or any number of nationally recognized rehabilitation facilities.

II. A PERSONAL ANALYSIS

7. The necessities 1) of understanding your clients and helping them to create vocational and personal goals; 2) of being recognized as a professional facility by other educational, rehabilitation, and manpower programs; and 3) of paying the bills (evaluation is a service for which funds are available), have influenced many facilities to provide evaluation. Frequently, it is an administrative decision to offer the service, and therefore systems are frequently developed which meet the needs of the organization rather than being designed to meet the needs of the client. Frequently also is the decision to go with the "least expensive system". How can we consense upon terminologies for this field, when each program is uniquely defined by the attitudes regarding its importance and its relationship to other programs, in a given facility, as held by the administrator, the supervisors, and the other staff?

8. Research likewise has been done out of the needs of the organization -- the need for the development of an acceptable program, the need for a professional

status for practitioners, etc.). It has been largely university based and has involved only a limited number of practitioners.

9. By and large most practicing evaluators do not write. There are several reasons which might be given for this: Their inexperience, the fact that they have not read very widely in the field, the time pressures of their job, or perhaps, the constant need to write evaluations and other reports. These factors leave many evaluators less than enthusiastic for any other writing. What ever the reason, most writing is done by administrators who give general background and history of their own programs, by university professors who are trying to get at the fundamental theory behind the delivery of evaluation services, and by project directors who are writing up the results of their research or demonstration projects. There is nothing wrong with what is being written, it is necessary. However, there is a wide gap left for practitioners to fill with practical help to their colleagues in the field. There has also been little writing comparing vocational evaluation with other fields of endeavor -- medicine, social science, etc.

10. Much has been done, however, more than most evaluators are willing to encounter. A frequent comment from practicing evaluators is "there really hasn't been much written about vocational evaluation" or "I want something practical, all that theory stuff is over my head". The evaluator who believes there has been little written has not looked, and the evaluator who refuses to deal with the theory has not acknowledged his responsibility to himself, his clients, and the field. Frequently, the evaluator relies on the excuse that he is already overworked, and, therefore, has no time to read. In addition, most facilities pay little attention to in-service training for their evaluators.

III. THEORY AND PRACTICE

11. Anyone who diagnosis and prescribes programs of change for individuals should be well trained, yet, in practice, many evaluators are young, inexperienced, and learn to be evaluators by experimenting with clients. An evaluator should be knowledgeable about learning theory, available training opportunities for clients, and should know the job market in order to enable the client and his counselor to make realistic decisions regarding future work. Conversely, many evaluators have neither worked at a full-time job before becoming an evaluator, nor conscientiously researched their local job market. An evaluator should be able to be empathic with the client, to encourage his best work, to be the client's advocate, and yet be objective. A number of evaluators, however, are so objective that they are merely impersonal recorders of information, and others become so personally involved with their clients that they lose their objectivity.

12. In order to be affective, an evaluator must have good, applicable tools which are comprehensive and which allow the client to probe into his own needs and abilities. Many systems, however, are designed to evaluate the urban male in a limited number of occupational clusters which fall primarily to lower skill and lower economic categories. The evaluator has to depend primarily upon his own personally developed skills and abilities to inspire his client to put forth his best efforts, and upon his personal skills to be able to comprehend and interpret data from many contributing sources including the client, other agencies, and professionals who have sought to help the client.

13. It would seem that to do his best job, an evaluator would need to have a good rapport with his clients, but frequently they become merely numbers or are associated with classic cases in the evaluators own history ("HE's just like old. . ."). An evaluator should be able to communicate well with other professionals, and have the confidence of, and in, other members of the staff within the facility in which he works. Frequently, he gets little cooperation from other professionals and frightens

4.

other members of the facility staff because of his constant questions or their fear that "telling it like it is", will hurt the client.

14. Evaluation should be a part of every client's rehabilitation plan, that is not to say that every client should participate in a formal vocational evaluation program, but that evaluation should take place. Frequently, however, little evaluation of the client's previous history is considered in the writing of the vocational and remediation plans and, very often, it is only after other systems have failed that the client is sent to be "evaluated" as a "court of last resort".

IV. THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

15. The Vocational Evaluation Project was an attempt to pull together the wisdom of knowledgeable administrators, university personnel who have done theoretical probing and writing in the field heretofore, and the practical "grassroots" experience of over 1,000 people involved in the Vocational Evaluation process throughout the United States. Participating forums span the continent from Boston to San Francisco, from New Orleans to Duluth. There were 6 local discussion forums spread throughout 30 states.

16. Seventeen "Coordinators" created position papers on 16 delimited topics regarding vocational evaluation. Each forum read one of these papers and reacted to it in light of its own personal experiences. At the same time, each individual sent information to the project, via three short questionnaires, which related to his own personal experience. At a second session, forums brainstormed and organized into a tentative writing outline.

17. Each coordinator received the writing outline from the three or four forums (which were assigned to discuss his paper). He responded to their outlines and sent questions back to each forum for further work and clarification. The forums then re-worked their outlines and corporately wrote a short statement regarding their agreement and disagreement in relation to their topic.

18. All of the statements were collected and duplicated for the first national seminar in Atlanta, Georgia. Research data including the statements, the writing outlines, the 17 original position papers, and results of the questionnaires were the spring board for that conference. At that time, participants made up of the 17 coordinators and 17 forum leaders from participating forums corporately wrote a preliminary statement on the state of the art of vocational evaluation--1973.

18. Halmos (1970) points to "sociological inquiry and communication themselves as major social actions and interventions". The vocational evaluation project in its first year has had an impact upon the field of evaluation. It has been the catalyst for discussion and idea sharing between professionals in vocational rehabilitation, special education, and vocational education.

20. The work of the first year, and the articles which follow in this book, represent significant opinions regarding vocational education in 1973. The authors were chosen because of their first-hand knowledge of the field. They were originally published as individual papers for the use of the individual local forums, but are reprinted here as a group because of their value as a comprehensive statement on vocational evaluation, in 1973. While they stand on their own, they also represent the first step toward a common understanding of the ideology of vocational evaluation.

Stanley H. Crow

1. A crucial element in the occupational identity of the vocational evaluator, is the self story (concept) which the evaluator has of himself and his craft. The occupational ideology of vocational evaluation (as within any occupation) is significant in determining its public acceptance, continued viability, and growth or decline as a vocationally unique specialty. In addition to mediating the internal operations and functioning of vocational evaluation, this occupational ideology influences the conceptions that other occupations and professions, the clientele served, and the general public have of evaluation. To some extent all occupational ideologies contain elements of fact, fallacy, and stereotyped thinking or mythology which contribute to the total conceptualization of that field. A thorough examination of the ideology, and self concept of the vocational evaluator, is an essential ingredient in understanding the occupational and social organization which characterizes the field as a whole.

2. The self concept of the evaluator, as viewed from the analytical framework of sociological study can be characterized within the following dimensions: 1) Parochialism-ecumenism - a parochial ideology and self concept is seldom diffused to other occupations, while an ecumenic one is disseminated among multiple occupations and to the occupational world in general; 2) Stratification - occupations characterized as being professional have more complete and well articulated ideologies and self concepts, while those which are not professional and are semi-professional have a less completely defined sense of occupational identity; 3) Boundary maintenance - occupational ideology may contribute to a rigid definition of who is an occupational practitioner and what his competencies are, or to a more diffuse relationship which allows for less exclusive practice; 4) Indeterminate-determinate - an indeterminate self concept is characterized by few qualifications for occupational entry and minimum directives for guiding the worker in the specific details of his job, while a determinate one is characterized by more elaborate entry proscriptions and minutely determined rights, duties, and norms; 5) Stereotype - the occupational stereotypes suggested by self concept will determine training, remuneration, mobility, and occupational prestige; both the general public as well as the practitioner may be influenced by these occupational stereotypes and role expectations; 6) Special ideologies - self concept may be influenced by perceptions along the dichotomous distinctions of white-collar/blue-collar; helping/service, science/art; etc. These dimensions should be kept in mind when reviewing the historical development of the field. The basic framework of this paper on the vocational evaluator and vocational evaluation, is that of vocational evaluation as an "emerging profession". Currently, vocational evaluation may be considered as a semi-profession, which denotes that it does not rest upon a firm body of theoretical knowledge, has a relatively short training period, and cannot claim a monopoly of exclusive skills. The semi-professional self concept of the vocational evaluator, who is striving for professional status, will be examined to determine the unique subculture (mores, roles, norms, folkways) of the field.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

3. The early organizational attempts and literature of a semi-profession for professional status, is largely concerned with the delineation of a unique occupational role and a rationale for existence. Much of the early and even current literature within vocational evaluation is directed to this end. One of the earliest written rationales for vocational evaluation is that of Frederick A. Whitehouse (Whitehouse, 1953); this article discusses the limitations of standard tests, and suggests the contribution of the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled Guidance Test Classes. The vocational evaluator, as described, is a job sample administrator and provides a specialized and valid source of vocational information to the inter-

disciplinary rehabilitation team (training instructor, vocational counselor, psychologist, physician). Thus, Whitehouse presents and defines the concept of a "living period" evaluation, specifies how it is distinct from other sources and client information, outlines the role of the evaluator and his unique contribution to information needed by other rehabilitation professionals. This rationale represents an early effort to create a parochial image for the vocational evaluator as a distinct member of the rehabilitation team. It was parochial not only in being limited to the field of vocational rehabilitation, but also because it arose from a specific rehabilitation agency program and would conceivably only be translated into the program of other rehabilitation agencies.

4. Several years later, Redkey and White presented a detailed and comprehensive program plan for the development, organization, and operation of a prototype vocational evaluation unit. This provided governmental sanction for vocational evaluation activities within public rehabilitation centers mandated by the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act and Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act of 1954. As defined by the monograph, pre-vocational activities are of a specific nature and "directed toward an evaluation of the patients' vocational potentialities" by means of a "realistic appraisal of [individual] capacities and abilities". This definition describes a distinct unit or organizational structure within the medically oriented rehabilitation center, which provides trial work experiences for clients. The specialization and differentiation of the pre-vocational unit, and the role of the "pre-vocational supervisor", were easily translatable to a much larger class of rehabilitation facilities than that of Whitehouse's. Furthermore, an organizing structure is the same organizational level as P.T., O.T., psychology, social work, and similar departments in centers. The equipment, staffing, record keeping, floor plans, etc. of the pre-vocational unit are described with great detail and specificity. The pre-vocational unit supervisor, as described, is required to have diagnostic and evaluative abilities which are not possessed by other rehabilitation professionals. These abilities are not described in detail, but are precursors of later and more detailed and precise definitions of the competencies and responsibilities of the vocational evaluator. In contrast to vocational evaluation as a distinct one time process performed by a distinct unit within a center, the private sector rehabilitation program perceived vocational evaluation quite differently. As described in a widely disseminated publication (Thompson, 1958) "evaluation is a continuous, not a static service". This concept is further reinforced as follows: "Although much specialized diagnosis and evaluation may precede admission to the workshop, continued diagnosis and evaluation are necessitated.... Compartmentalized diagnosis and evaluation completed under laboratory conditions of a specialized nature sometimes differ from those of a real work situation.... Evaluation should continue under the work situation." Thus, quite early in the history of the vocational evaluation movement, differing conceptions of the vocational evaluation process as influenced by differing bureaucratic structures (the publicly supported rehabilitation center and the private rehabilitation workshop) presents itself. The influence of bureaucratic factors upon the conceptualization of vocational evaluation, and the evaluator, are still with us today.

5. In 1960, some 6 years of experience in vocational evaluation was summarized by the Iowa Conference on Pre-Vocational Activities (Muthard, 1960) which clearly stated the nature of vocational evaluation at that time. The pre-vocational unit in differing organizational structures was discussed in relation to staff and methodology. In addition, program descriptions for the rehabilitation facilities, which had pioneered in pre-vocational activities, were provided at this conference. This provided visibility and legitimation for the general adoption of vocational evaluation as a distinct service category. A number of key questions were confronted in small group discussions which

produced a more refined definition and rationale for pre-vocational activities as a counseling adjunct in guidance and selection. General comments were generated regarding the client for evaluation, the characteristics of a good pre-vocational evaluation system and appropriate research questions. Although the "pre-vocational evaluator" is not discussed in detail, in his address to the conference, Martin Moed of I.C.D. discussed the varying backgrounds of evaluators and suggested the evaluator as needing a composite interdisciplinary training or education. This is one of the earliest attempts at stratification and the establishment of boundary maintenance for vocational evaluation. During the next 5 years, a number of articles relating to vocational evaluation appeared in various rehabilitation and related journals which further refined its application to a variety of client disability groups and to disparate organizational settings. Finally, in 1966, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration issued a publication, concerning goals, methods, techniques, and processes in an effort to resolve the "considerable confusion and discrepancy currently existing between [vocational evaluation] units." (Little, 1966); the document is designed as an "operating guideline" for vocational evaluation units, and provides well defined operational goals and standards, which are proscriptive in nature. In the matter of personnel, the responsibilities, training, and experiential background of the rehabilitation team are discussed in detail and, it is noted that, there is no recognized training requirements for vocational evaluators.

6. Eventually, a Vocational Evaluation Graduate Curriculum was developed at Stout State University (P. Hoffman, 1967) to fill the increasingly expressed needs for specialized training in vocational evaluation. This effort has not only led to the promulgation of several other university programs, but it has legitimated the need for specialized training (an aspect of boundary maintenance) in vocational evaluation, and to the collection and dissemination of a more succinct knowledge base. At about the same time, a national organization of vocational evaluators was developing which is now known as the Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (V.E.W.A.A.). The formation of this professional organization, and the development of a professional code of ethics, and the values of a service orientation, (V.E.W.A.A. Bulletin, 1971) indicates further steps in the professionalization process. Recent efforts to more finely define the identity, duties, role (and consequently the self concept of the vocational evaluator) have been generated at a speedy pace (Pruitt and Pacinelli, 1969; Hoffman, 1969; *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 1970; Pacinelli, 1970; IRS Conference, 1972). Furthermore, there have recently been ecumenic suggestions that vocational evaluation is widely applicable in educational, social welfare, and other service settings. The efforts detailed above have culminated in the V.E.W.A.A. Special Project Forums in 1973-1974, which are clearly designed to refine the identity and ideology of vocational evaluation and the vocational evaluator.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS

7. Much of the equivocation currently experienced in vocational evaluation, and the attendant crisis of identity experienced by the vocational evaluator, is the result of the professionalization process itself. Early efforts in vocational evaluation concentrated upon differentiating the vocational evaluator as a succinct and distinctive member of the rehabilitation team. No problem was encountered in locating a suitable clientele for vocational evaluation, since vocational evaluation adopted the traditional rehabilitation client already served by rehabilitation agencies. The true challenge of the emerging field has been the definition of a unique and systematic body of knowledge which is differentiated from other professions. Although this process continues today, vocational evaluation is still experiencing the professional marginality of a semi-profession in transition. This is true, since there continues to be a lack of congruence between the occupational ideology expressed by the literature of the field and the actual role of the practitioner evaluator. A

discrepancy exists between the image and the reality in vocational evaluation for a number of reasons. This marginality is comparable to that of the immigrant who is on the periphery of two cultures, and who has the norms and values of his old cultures as well as that of his new culture. For the vocational evaluator, the contradictions or inconsistencies of only partial professionalization produces conflicting expectations and occupational uncertainties.

8. In the first place, these uncertainties arise because of the non-homogeneity of practitioner evaluators. Few evaluators have the specialized formal training or experience base that would appear to be prerequisite for the professional vocational evaluator. Furthermore, vocational evaluators function in disparate employment situations which do not easily fit the generalities and generalizations suggested in the literature. The currently practicing vocational evaluator has had his academic training in a diversity of other fields, and his ideological allegiances and identity often defer to his background in industrial education, psychology, counseling, etc. The non-homogeneity which is characteristic of the field makes the process of occupational socialization all the more difficult, and is one reason for the lack of identity and a contradictory self concept. Since a large percentage of practitioners are not V.E.W.A.A. members, the social mechanism of collegial evaluation and approval does not effectively operate to control entry, rewards, and advancement in the field.

9. Another significant reason for anomie within vocational evaluation is the lack of professional autonomy due to the superordinate control of the employing rehabilitation agency. Self control, with regard to the development and application of a body of knowledge, is essential to the development of a professional knowledge base. Typically, the evaluator is subordinated to the goals, procedures, and structures of the agency that employs him. External bureaucratic control produces the identity strains evidenced when the evaluator is confronted by an inconsistent, internal framework. An occupational ideology has been advanced by "career activists" in an effort to bring about occupational change, and this ideology often runs counter to organizational ideology. Vocational evaluation is heteronomous to the extent that it is guided not only by professional norms, expert knowledge, and its own professional community, but also by the administrative rules of an organizational hierarchy. As has been suggested, the organizational requirements of publicly-supported rehabilitation centers differ from those of privately-supported rehabilitation facilities, creating a dichotomous conception of vocational evaluation. This situation reflects a further source of ideological inconsistency and incongruence effecting the self concept of the vocational evaluator.

10. A further contributor to the incongruent ideology in vocational evaluation is the often diffuse relationship between the evaluator and evaluatee. Vocational evaluators too often are not really specialists, and are expected to deal with a large number and diversity of client types and client problems. This lack of specialization contributes to an incomplete occupational ideology and uncomfortableness on the part of the evaluator as unrealistic demands are made upon him. The evaluator often feels inadequate in coping with the unrealistic and uniformed demands of his employing agency and other professionals, and the challenge of having the magical answer for every unanswered client characteristic or problem area. Unrealistic expectations are likely to have resulted from the exaggerated expertise advanced by "career activists" in ideological propagation. The true capacities, experience, and education of the practicing evaluator often falls short of the advertised expertise of the field, and thus may create impossible performance expectations.

THE QUESTION OF THEORY

11. The complete development of any profession in transition relies upon ideological texts, theories, doctrines, or concepts which are proposed by the interest group (the proponent) to influence and direct the behavior or actions of a target group or groups. The target group may be the rank and file member, other professionals, government, the clientele, or the general public; it is via this mechanism that the semi-profession can completely professionalize and advance its influence upon others. This mechanism, of course, is multi-purpose and multi-targeted, and may change its function over time, lose relevance, be superseded, and finally be replaced by a new ideology having differing inter-group ends. Most writers agree that the core characteristics, distinguishing a profession from other occupations, are these: a basic body of theoretical knowledge (the knowledge base), a command of special skills and competencies in the application of this knowledge, and guidance by a code of ethics which focuses upon service to the client. Vocational evaluation has been classified as a semi-profession in this paper, since several of these qualities are not as yet fully developed.

12. There is no systematic knowledge base now; only a short period of specialized education and training (if any) is required to practice as a vocational evaluator. The early trend in vocational evaluation has consisted of emphasis upon method, techniques, organizational principles, and occupational distinctiveness, while little effort has been made to develop the systematic knowledge base and theory required of a profession. There has been, of course, some notable exceptions, including Neff, Nadolsky Barad, and others, but, nevertheless, this codification still alludes the field. Emphasis upon method and techniques should continue, however, if not reinforced by a theoretical framework, the viability and progress of vocational evaluation will suffer. It should be noted that the definition of vocational evaluation has gradually evolved from legal/administrative and descriptive definitions to functional or operational definitions. This refinement is essential if the field is to develop testable and researchable questions, which will contribute to theoretical analysis and theory building.

13. The Code of Ethics, advanced by V.E.W.A.A in 1970, reflects an incompletely developed knowledge base through its vague generalizations. Even if he is aware of them, it is difficult for the individual practitioner to concretize the concepts contained in this document. Although this Code of Ethics is an attempt to indicate a professional community of vocational evaluators, it is difficult to interpret and enforce the code. The practicality of any code of ethics relies upon the self control, social education, and public recognition of a strong and influential professional association. This can be reinforced by widely dispersed and active majority membership of practitioners, licensure or certification requirements, widely recognized and accepted educational requirements, and the resolution of conflicting elements. It is clear that the development of the current Code of Ethics is premature, since this code does not in any way limit entry, internal composition, and unscrupulous or unprofessional behavior and practices. That is, the professional norms suggested by this Code are unenforceable. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that although the code indicates that "primary responsibility is to the client"; bureaucratic responsibility to the philosophies, goals and practices of the employing agency is also stressed.

14. The ideal of service to the client group, and to professional authority in contrast to bureaucratic authority, is strongly felt by a large body of vocational evaluators. However, there is no monopoly over special competencies which are regulated by licensure or certification, or even a legal basis for privileged communication with clients. Since, by its nature, bureaucratic control consists of a universalistic set of rules and generalized procedures, there is an inconsistency with the professional rehabilitation goals of vocational evaluation which are individualized and particularized. The only means that the vocational evaluator has to strengthen and reinforce his sources of professional identification are

through professional organizations, which will provide the "rites of intensification", to enable the nurturance and development of his identity and of his craft.

CRITICAL DEFINITIONAL QUESTIONS

15. The basic framework of this paper has rested upon the assumption that the self concept of the evaluator has largely been determined by the nature of the process of professionalization. The most widely accepted conception of the vocational evaluator, as he is viewed today, is that of a technician-implementer. In contrast, several "career activist" vocational evaluators, acting as spokesmen for the field, have suggested the more professionalized concept of the expert vocational evaluation practitioner. The fact of professionalization has no valence (either as a positive or negative force), since it is viewed here as a natural process, which each occupation must deal with some time. It is a fact of life from which further assumptions must and should be made.
16. What then are the issues which must be dealt with to further define and describe the self story (concept) of vocational evaluation? First, there is the question of the knowledge base and its continued refinement and development. Related to this is the dichotomous and contradictory ideology arising from practices in centers, versus those in facilities, and whether this dichotomy will hamper the development of the field. Should the focus on practical knowledge be continued or should the emphasis shift to academic theoretical concerns (or perhaps a division of labor where both are accomplished)? Perhaps the establishment of the private vocational evaluation practitioner or consultant will facilitate the development of this knowledge base. Are there any alternatives to the establishment of this knowledge base? With regards to the dissemination of the field, questions must be asked of the parochial-ecumenic nature of the field, stratification, boundary differentiation and maintenance, the determinateness-indeterminateness of the field, and alteration or acceptance of internal and external stereotypes.
17. With regards to the specialization of the field, questions must be asked with regards to bureaucratic versus professional control within the occupation, and ways in which this issue can be dealt with. Organizations which employ the semi-professional are typically authoritarian in administrative style, and considerable compliance is required. Unlike more securely established professions where the practitioner is esteemed and rewarded, the evaluator must normally become a supervisor or administrator, to be successful and influential in these organizations. The turnover of rehabilitation personnel reinforces this lack of authority and prestige, since collegial solidarity is fragmented and hampered by rapid entry and egress from the field. Occupations which seek professional status must engage in transactions concerning prestige, power, and money with the society at large and this involves public dissemination of the occupational ideology. This issue must be addressed and dealt with prior to full development.
18. Finally, the issue of our professional organization, V.E.W.A.A., must be dealt with in a meaningful manner. That is, if an aggregate effort to contribute to the process of forming an occupational ideology and true profession is necessary, how is this to be best accomplished? The acquisition of a theoretical and occupational specialization for vocational evaluation will, in the end result, contribute to the economic advantage of the profession itself; but, by raising requirements for the competence of entrants, establishing control over the ethics and qualitative performance of practitioners, and improving techniques in providing service, society as a whole will benefit. Given an ideal of service derived from the mother field of vocational rehabilitation, the resolution of these issues seems essential to the delivery of promised services.

CHALLENGE TO THE FIELD

19. The key questions which should be confronted by the field in light of the analysis presented above, are as follows: 1) What is the best means by which a sufficient knowledge base can be established along with continuing practical support for the practitioner? 2) Need there be a resolution of ideological inconsistencies between the literature and actual practice in the field? How is this best to be accomplished? 3) Are separate models for vocational evaluation in the public sector necessary to clearly differentiate them from the private sector? 4) What is the best means to deal with the issue to bureaucratic versus professional or collegial control in the practice of vocational evaluation? 5) If deemed appropriate, what steps are necessary to increase the support and acceptance of V.E.W.A.A. by practicing evaluators, the general public, the client groups, government, and other professionals? Should vocational evaluation stress parochial or ecumenic acceptance of the field? 6) Should V.E.W.A.A. attempt to enforce more restrictive entry, stringent rules of practice, and educational criteria for practice as a vocational evaluator? 7) Finally, will the process of forming a "grassroots forum" contribute to the occupational identity of the forum members and what will initiate or sustain this more complete self concept?

20. Additionally, there should be a number of questions which arise from the discussion of this paper. Feel free to challenge any of the concepts, comments, or opinions expressed in the body of the document, and suggest alternate rationales or conceptualizations which arise from this discussion. The issues confronted are of such a nature, that controversy is to be expected if the topic areas are to be completely explored and analyzed. Above all, this forum topic should be confronted from the vantage point of.....evaluator, evaluate thyself!

CHARLES S. RICHMAN

THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR: A TASK ANALYSIS

1. According to Hoffman (1972), vocational evaluation is a comprehensive process that systematically utilizes work, real or simulated, as the focal point for vocational exploration and assessment, the purpose of which is to assist individuals in vocational development. Vocational evaluation incorporates medical, psychological, social, vocational, educational, cultural, and economic data in the attainment of the goals of the evaluation process. It is an assessment process beginning with a referral for evaluation and ending with a recommendation for further services needed by the individual. Evaluation is goal oriented, with the goals being developed from comprehensive referral information and awareness of counselor-client objectives.
2. Evaluation, no matter what it is called in the various settings in which it is provided, is the key to successful decision making and the identification of life goals for individuals seeking such direction. The role of "evaluator," no matter what it is called, is the role of one who guides individuals through the decision making process by facilitating among many options for living. The function of vocational evaluation, and the role of vocational evaluator, must be identified at least in part in terms of the jobs and tasks he performs. In this regard the U.S. Employment Service defines job analysis as a systematic study of the worker in terms of what he does in relation to date, people and things, the methodologies and techniques employed, the machines, tools, equipment and work aids used, the materials, products, subject matter, or services which result, and the traits required of the worker. A task is defined as one or more elements and is one of the distinct activities that constitute logical and necessary steps in the performance of work by the worker. A task is created whenever human effort, physical or mental, is exerted to accomplish a specific purpose.

BRIEF REVIEW OF LITERATURE

3. Pruitt (1972) has done perhaps the most comprehensive review of the literature in regard to task analysis for vocational evaluators. He has identified three major studies, one by the University of Pittsburgh, R & T Center, 1969, one by Egerman and Gilbert, 1969, and one by Sankovsky, 1971. The Pittsburgh study (1969) considered such factors as the emphasis of the facility, types of services provided, whether the facility was non-profit or governmental, its geographic location, staffing patterns, number of vocational evaluation staff, educational level of the evaluators, educational major of the evaluator, previous work experience, type of disabilities served by the facility, length of evaluation period and average number of clients evaluated within specified time periods, client follow-up, objectives of the vocational evaluation program, and average amount of time spent on specified vocational functions. Their most significant finding was that differences in vocational evaluation services are a function of the emphasis, location, and staffing patterns of the facilities studied.
4. Egerman and Gilbert (1969) conducted a somewhat similar study in reviewing the variables of educational background, employment history, work activities, salary, job knowledge and satisfaction, professional affiliation, and personal characteristics of the respondents. Of special relevance were findings pertaining to work activities of evaluators. The following functions were listed by over 60 percent of the respondents: Attending and participating in regularly scheduled staff meetings and staffings, Observing clients at work, Helping clients adjust to work environment, Writing periodic reports on client progress, Administering work sample tests, or

performance measures; Developing recommendations for training, placement, etc., based in part on test scores; and Teaching clients good work habits. Evaluators were most knowledgeable in the administration of work sample or work performance tests, and in the interpretation of these results. The three areas which they knew least about were the selection, administration, and interpretation of psychological tests.

5. Sankovsky (1969) studied the patterns of services in vocational evaluation. This study did not consider the percentage of time that evaluators spend performing the various work evaluation functions. However, it did indicate the number of facilities offering these services, and the time that was spent on several functions. The following evaluation approaches that were considered useful were ranked as follows:

Job sample	26 percent
Situational Approach	24 percent
Job Tryout	20 percent
Psychological Testing	18 percent
Job Analysis	1 percent

6. Pruitt concludes that there has been a very limited number of research studies dealing with the role and functions of vocational evaluators. His study was conducted to validate the task analysis for the job of vocational evaluator and to compare a group of evaluators having master's degree in vocational rehabilitation with that speciality, with a second group lacking the formal training and graduate degree in vocational evaluation. He concluded that seven major functions were being carried out, involving 67 major tasks. He also concluded that formally trained master's degree level work evaluators view the relative importance of evaluator tasks differently from informally trained evaluators working in facilities in Wisconsin. These groups were, however, not opposed to each other, but differed in degree only.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS

7. My personal experience with vocational evaluation has been limited to two settings: a comprehensive state rehabilitation center and a youthful offender rehabilitation project located in a rural community. In the state center evaluators had been trained in rehabilitation counseling, vocational instruction, clinical psychology, and occupational therapy. Each evaluator learned his job on the job. He accomplished his job as he saw fit and used techniques and procedures he felt most comfortable with. In one sense vocational evaluation suffered from the ambiguity of being rather non-standardized and non-bureaucratized. However, that may also have been a positive virtue.

8. The youthful offender rehabilitation project operated by Teledyne Economic for Los Angeles County employs vocational evaluators with vocational education and instructional backgrounds. This is because the focus of the project is oriented toward vocational orientation, world of work exposure, and the selection of a skill (cluster) for training. In other words the nature of the clientele (adjudged offenders aged 16-18 with frequently associated school drop-out and drug problems) and the focus of the project lead to the selection of certain types of people as vocational evaluators.

9. These findings are consistent with those of the researchers reported above. It is entirely possible that effectiveness may be more attributable to certain personal characteristics and genuine feelings of concern, (similarly to the Carkhuff studies in regard to counselors) rather than academic training or tasks

14.

performed per se. In neither of the instances cited above were philosophical assumptions or sophisticated, statistical devices considered or employed on the part of pragmatically, oriented evaluators.

10. It is of interest to note that although these forums are concerned with job or task analysis, only one per cent of evaluators in Sankovsky's study thought that job analysis was useful in working with individual clients.

THEORY AS RELATED TO PRACTICE

11. In performing a task analysis on the functions of the vocational evaluator, it is instructive to look at the context in which he works. This context includes the objective of the service, facility, or administrative entity, as well as the objective of the particular evaluator or evaluation team, working in conjunction with a number of clients. It also includes the assumptions underlying data analysis and decision making activities. Finally, it includes major professional implications for the growth of the profession of vocational evaluator itself. In terms of agency or facility objective, the task of the vocational evaluator is rightfully (according to current legislation) concerned with a vocational objective. However, it must be kept in mind that, perhaps, over the long term, we are evaluating for employability rather than for a specific vocational outcome per se. The recently vetoed Rehabilitation Act addressed itself to this issue as well as some of the current research on non-vocational outcomes being carried out by Overs at the Milwaukee Curative Workshop.

12. The objective of the individual evaluator might seem to fall into different categories of effort. Is he evaluating from a "personnel" perspective, or from a "human development" perspective? If, indeed, he is evaluating as a personnel man, he is concerned with the development of selection ratios and the screening-/out of only certain types of people. If he is concerned with human development, he can take the same data and use it for diagnostic and prescriptive purposes.

13. It may be important here also to note the difference between selection and classification outcomes. Selection policy calls for the specific selection, i.e. the pinpointing of the best man for a specific situation, even if others are bypassed, i.e. selection of Peace Corps volunteers for specific assignments. Classification, on the other hand, calls for optimal performance. Therefore, if 1,000 lawyers enlist in the Army and 999 infantrymen are called for plus one lawyer, then 999 lawyers will be classified as infantrymen. In other words, classification calls for optimal group performance rather than maximizing individual performance.

14. Finally, the issue of professional implications must be addressed. Is there, or should there be a separate discipline of vocational evaluator? Are there advantages (which outweigh the disadvantages) in carrying out this function using a variety of people with different professional backgrounds? Is the fledgling profession strong enough to tolerate its own ambiguity of function, or will it suffer from a "premature closure" and locking-in. Should vocational evaluation be "owned" by any one discipline?

SEVERAL UNDERLYING QUESTIONS

15. The question of data collection and analysis is important in terms of a reductionistic versus a holistic view of the world. This issue is both practical and philosophic and concerns the idea of whether the whole is greater than the sum of its parts or whether, by reducing all components to job activities, motion studies, etc., any kind of accurate picture can be ascertained. A subsidiary issue involves the notion of statistical versus clinical prediction discussed Meehl (1954). Meehl ultimately concluded that neither one was sufficient unto itself

but that statistical data were very effective in narrowing the field of choice while ultimately, no matter how good this data was, individual decisions had to be made clinically (subjectively). He also discussed the validating versus the structural implications in using statistical data. He concluded that his statistics served an important validating function, but did little to explain underlying causes, i.e. structural elements.

16. At least four major questions come to mind. Each of them derive from the overlay questions as to whether a task analysis should be performed at all at this time. Task analysis is an empirical technique which reports what is, rather than what should be, or what might be. As such, immediate conclusions can too conveniently be converted to curricula's, operating policies, etc. Question #1: Can we withstand this temptation? Furthermore, my hope is that the results of this forum will be seen in context as being only 1/16 of the entire project. Question #2: Can we understand the results of a task analysis--similarities and differences--without making premature value judgements or without seeing things in context?

17. A study of this kind sets up a model for task analysis of vocational evaluators which, in effect, serves as a model for their day-to-day activities. In effect, the profession blesses this approach. Important data may be gained using this approach, as long as the data, conclusions, and interpretations are seen within an overall context. Question #3: Is the profession secure enough to consider more humanistic alternatives or the possible application of Carkhuff's findings in vocational evaluation?

18. Finally, in dealing with the real world one is struck with the realization that there are no absolutes - no 100% correct observations, decisions, actions, or circumstances. At best, we must keep in mind that decisions are most often made in terms of taking the best option among available options i.e. considering available alternative strategies. Question #4: Can we consider the result of this task analysis as tentative and indeed the process itself as tentative in terms of real world options?

19. My CHALLENGE TO THE FORUM at this time is two fold. First, we must individually conduct a task analysis of ourselves i.e. our duties, functions, and tasks. With this in mind, a copy of the official U.S. Department of Labor Job Analysis Schedule (OMB 44-R0722) is attached. The title, vocational evaluator, does not suggest a commonality of tasks, but rather a commonality of purpose. Therefore, similarities and differences between vocational evaluators must be articulated. In addition, they need to articulate the tasks, which they perform, which are related to vocational evaluation, and which are not.

20. The second part of this challenge is to, upon completion of the analysis, consider together the questions of theory as related to practice, as well as other questions outlined above in defining this topic, so that results might be interpreted in some context and, as a forum, write a statement regarding the results of your deliberations.

RAYMOND A. EHRLE



VOCATIONAL
EVALUATION
PROJECT

2

HEW GRANT # 12-P-55958/3-01

JANUARY 1973

16.

U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration

OMB 44-R0722

Estab. & Sched. No. VE 73-100-

JOB ANALYSIS SCHEDULE

1. Estab. Job Title VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR; work evaluator;
 2. Ind. Assign. Rehabilitation; Manpower; Schools; Corrections
 3. SIC Code(s) and Title(s) _____

Code

WTA Group

DOT Title

Ind. Desig.

4. JOB SUMMARY:

5. WORK PERFORMED RATINGS:

	D	P	T
Worker Functions	Data	People	Things

Work Field 211-Appraising 294-Healing Caring
 M.P.S.M.S. 952-Guidance-Advisory

6. WORKER TRAITS RATINGS:

GED 1 2 3 4 5 6
 SVP 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 Aptitudes G V N S P Q K F M E C
 Temperaments D F I J M P R S T V
 Interests 1a 1b 2a 2b 3a 3b 4a 4b 5a 5b
 Phys. Demands S L M H V 2 3 4 5 6
 Environ. Cond. I O B 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. General Education

- a. Elementary _____ High School _____ Courses _____
 b. College _____ Courses _____

8. Vocational Preparation

- a. College _____ Courses _____
- b. Vocational Education _____ Courses _____
- c. Apprenticeship _____
- d. Inplant Training _____
- e. On-the-Job Training _____
- f. Performance on Other Jobs _____

9. Experience _____

10. Orientation _____

11. Licenses, etc. _____

12. Relation to Other Jobs and Workers

Promotion: From _____ To _____

Transfers: From _____ To _____

Supervision Received _____

Supervision Given _____

13. Machines, Tools, Equipment, and Work Aids

14. Materials and Products

15. Description of Tasks:

18.

16. Definition of Terms

17. General Comments

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JOB ANALYSIS SCHEDULE

While Neff (1966) listed Job Analysis as an Evaluation Technique, many evaluators are willing to admit they do not have the techniques or know the methods required.

The Handbook for Analyzing Jobs, U.S. Department of Labor, 1972, available from the U.S.G.P.O., Washington, D.C. 20402 (Price \$2.50, Stock #2900-0313) gives full information on Job Analysis techniques when used with the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Volume II.

The following information, while very incomplete is edited from Chapter V. While to be completely accurate you should use the handbook, you will have a much clearer picture of your job in relation to the "Vocational Evaluation Project" if you concentrate upon items 4, 5, and 7 thru 17. Directions for the other items have been eliminated and very tentative data have been entered in some of the omitted areas.

For area identification, enter your Forum number in the upper right hand corner after the hyphen in Estab. & Sched. No. VE 73-100-.

ITEM 4. JOB SUMMARY

Enter a brief, yet comprehensive, statement to provide the reader with the purpose and nature of the job, and to reflect the significant involvement(s) of the worker with data, people, and/or things, and the level of such involvement(s). Examples of job summaries follow:

- a. Solve problems in high mathematics in such fields as engineering, physics, and astronomy (data relationship) (synthesizing level).
- b. Sells furniture and bedding (data and people relationships) (compiling and persuading levels).
- c. Polices premises of private business establishment (people relationship) (Speaking-signaling level).
- d. Designs artistic interiors and sells decorating services (data, people, and things relationships) synthesizing, persuading, and precision working level).
- e. Supervises and coordinates activities of carpenters on housebuilding project (data, people, and things relationships).

ITEM 5. WORK PERFORMED RATINGS

PROCEDURE FOR RECORDING WORK PERFORMED RATINGS.

Worker Functions. Express the significant relationship(s) of the worker to data, people, and/or things by encircling the appropriate letter(s). Next, in the boxes under data, people, and things, enter the number that expresses the highest level of the worker's involvement in each of these three hierarchies.

DATA	PEOPLE	THINGS
0 Synthesizing	0 Mentoring	0 Setting Up
1 Coordinating	1 Negotiating	1 Precision Working
2 Analyzing	2 Instructing	2 Operating-Controlling
3 Compiling	3 Supervising	3 Driving-Operating
4 Computing	4 Diverting	4 Manipulating
5 Copying	5 Persuading	5 Tending
6 Comparing	6 Speaking-Signaling	6 Feeding-Offbearing
	7 Serving	7 Handling
	8 Taking Instructions- Helping	

ITEM 7. GENERAL EDUCATION

This is education of an academic nature obtained in elementary school, high school, and/or college, which does not have a specific occupational goal and is not vocationally oriented.

- a. Elementary and high school. Enter in the blanks the number of years required.
- b. College. Enter the number of years of general college education, courses, and degrees, if any, required for the performance of the job duties or for providing the bases for specialized vocational education.

ITEM 8. VOCATIONAL PREPARATION

This is the amount and kind of instruction and preparation required to learn the techniques, acquire the knowledge, and develop facility for average job performance. It is education such as that obtained through high school shop courses, in technical schools, as well as college training which is organized around a specific vocational objective. Vocational preparation also may be acquired by apprenticeship, in-plant training, etc. Each item is to be completed as described:

- a. College: Enter the number of years, the degrees, the subjects and the courses oriented towards a specific vocational goal. List mechanical engineering, dentistry, law education, etc. Include both undergraduate and advanced degree work.
- b. Vocational Education: Enter number of years and/or courses that develop skills for the specific occupational objective.
- c. Apprenticeship: Enter the length, name, and/or type of apprenticeship course, if this is one way in which to qualify for the job.
- d. In-plant Training: Enter here the length of the training time, and the nature and content of such courses. This training is any given by the employer in the form of an organized classroom type of study, whether actually in the plant or not.
- e. On-the-Job Training: Enter the length of this type of training, as a learner or trainee, under the instruction of a qualified worker that is furnished by the employer, for an inexperienced worker to reach normal production. (Do not enter the time required for orienting a qualified worker to a job.)
- f. Performance on Other Jobs: Identify the job(s) in this establishment or elsewhere in which the worker can acquire knowledge and training partially or to fully qualify for the job, and specify the length of time required for qualifying.

NOTE: If there are several kinds of training, any one of which will qualify the worker for the job, in the left margin of the first of such kinds of training, indicate the letter designation(s) of the other alternative(s). Example: If the job can be entered by means of either b. Vocational Educational or e. On-the-Job Training, enter in the left margin beside item b "or e". If a combination of kinds of training is required, insert the word, "and".

ITEM 9. EXPERIENCE

Record in this space the title(s) of any job(s) and length of experience in such job(s), which the employer requires the worker to have had either in the establishment under study or elsewhere. Enter the letters "SE" (Same Establishment) in parentheses after the job title(s) if the required experience must have been obtained in the establishment under study. If the employer does not require the worker to have had previous work experience, enter "None".

ITEM 10. ORIENTATION

Record the "break-in" time allowed by the employer for a worker to become familiar with the various phases of the working environment, such as personnel policy and practices, job location, lines of supervision, and location of tools and parts. Do not include in this item information pertaining to instructions in job duties.

ITEM 11. LICENSES, ETC.

List licenses, certification, or registry which indicate attainment of a recognized level of competence and/or which meet Federal, State, or local requirements.

ITEM 12. RELATION TO OTHER JOBS AND WORKERS

PROMOTION FROM. Indicate jobs from which persons are promoted to this job.

PROMOTION TO. Indicate jobs to which persons in this job are promoted.

TRANSFERS. Indicate job(s) from or to which persons in this job may transfer, which do not involve a promotion or demotion.

SUPERVISION RECEIVED. Enter the title of the worker from whom supervision is received.

SUPERVISION GIVEN. Enter the title(s) of the worker(s) to whom supervision is given and the number of persons with each title.

ITEM 13. MACHINE, TOOLS, EQUIPMENT, AND WORK AIDS

List each of the items used by the worker with the size, approximate weight, and other identifying information. Describe in detail any that are unusual or special, and with which the reader will not be familiar. In particular, those underlined in Item 15 must be described.

ITEM 14. MATERIALS AND PRODUCTS

List the raw material(s) and/or finished product(s) with which the worker is involved. If any one of these is not common or has a unique application as used in the job and is underlined in Item 15, it should be defined or described in this space.

ITEM 15. DESCRIPTION OF TASKS

Describe in concise form the task performed. Each description must designate the worker's actions and the results accomplished; the machines, tools, equipment, and/or work aids used; materials, products, subject matter, or services involved; and the requirements made of the worker.

If additional space is needed, use supplementary sheet(s).

In order to provide the clearest presentation, divide the job into its major tasks. Number each task consecutively and introduce it with a flag statement. (The flag statement is a short summary of the task and should be followed by a description of the elements it encompasses. For many kinds of jobs, the tasks should be described in the chronological order in which they are performed. However, in other types of jobs, the tasks should be listed in order of importance.)

Indicate in parenthesis at the end of each task description an estimate of the percentage of time required for its performance. The percentage should be on the basis of 100 percent for all of the tasks performed.

The style to be followed in recording the description of tasks should conform to the following basic rules:

- a. A terse, direct style should be used.
- b. The present tense should be used throughout.

- c. Each sentence should begin with an action verb.
- d. Each sentence must reflect an objective, either specifically stated or implied, in such manner as to be obvious to the reader. A single verb may sometimes reflect both objective and worker action.
- e. All words should impart necessary information; others should be omitted. Every precaution should be taken to use words that have only one possible connotation, and that specifically describe the manner in which the work is accomplished.
- f. The description of tasks should reflect the assigned work performed and worker traits ratings.

Keep in mind the necessity for stating a task completely, but do not allow the explanation to develop into a motion study. For example, regarding an inspector of small parts, it may be said, "Slides fingertips over machine edges to detect ragged edges and burrs."

On the other hand, it would be absurd to state, "Raises right hand one foot to table height, superimposes hand over mechanical part and, by depressing the first and second fingers to the machined part . . ." etc.

In recording tasks in Item 15, the names of any special or unusual machines, tools, equipment, and work aids, or materials and products should begin with initial capital letters, and be underlined the first time they appear. They should also be described in Item 13 and 14 respectively.

Similarly, all technical or little-known terms, or term with uncommon meanings, should begin with initial capital letters, underlined, the first time they appear. The words with initial capitals, underlined, will then be defined in Item 16, definition of terms.

ITEM 16. DEFINITION OF TERMS

List in alphabetical order and define each term which has been underlined in Item 15, for example:

GROWER'S NUMBER: A one or two-digit number by which each of the grower's customers is identified.

ITEM 17. GENERAL COMMENTS

Enter under this item any comments or explanations necessary concerning any of the previous items. The analyst should keep in mind the following:

- a. All comments should bear a proper cross reference to the section to which they relate.
- b. Statements of opinion as opposed to statements of fact should be stated as such and, where possible, the reasoning on which such opinion is formulated should be explained.
- c. Information which can appear under other items should appear there, and this item should be reserved for pertinent information for which there is no specific space allotted.

THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR: KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

1. Professionals might be characterized as those individuals who "profess" or declare themselves to be performing a work function which is based upon a unique, identifiable body of knowledge. A profession may be further identified by ongoing research, established criteria for training, an association of membership with a code of ethics which is recognized by society, and with criteria by which one can measure the competence of one's work performance. Vocational Evaluation at this time is moving toward professional stature by instituting and increasing its proficiency in these areas at a rapid pace. It is fundamental for any new field of work groping toward professional stature, such as Vocational Evaluation, to recognize and declare its unique sphere of knowledge and skills, and understand the sources from which it derived. Vocational Evaluation, as we now know it, has had an interesting development in that evaluators have moved into the arena of examining vocational potential from a variety of related fields e.g., occupational therapy, psychology, counseling, education, etc., which were somewhat involved in vocational appraisal, but were not in many instances making a comprehensive effort. Each of these professionals brought different experiences and theoretical orientations, which have contributed to the present state of the art of evaluation. It is only now that we are attempting to define our territory of unique knowledges and skills.

2. In relation to all the processes of Vocational Evaluation, the area of knowledge and skills stands as the base or cornerstone of the entire field. Without the skills to do the job or sufficient background knowledge of why it is done, there would be no field of evaluation! This being the case, we are led to ask, what collective knowledge and skills do vocational evaluators possess and how have they acquired them?

3. Speiser (in Pruitt, 1970) identifies the evaluators' roles with the client as assessor, vocational counselor, instructor, foreman or boss surrogate, co-worker, psychometrist, caseworker, and case coordinator. Each of these single roles plus a variety of additional roles requires the evaluator to possess separate and well developed skills. How does the evaluator come by these skills and what knowledges and skills are considered commonly needed? Egerman and Gilbert (1969), surveyed 293 members of The National Rehabilitation Association identified as work evaluators. They found that the activities evaluators feel they know most about are: 1) administering work samples or performance tests; 2) interpreting work samples or performance tests; 3) helping individuals adjust to work environments, 4) job skills necessary to succeed in specific jobs; and 5) selecting work samples or performance tests. Sankovsky (1971), in surveying 159 VEWA members, found exactly the same results in asking evaluators to rate what they knew. Further, his study concurred with Egerman and Gilbert in discovering that evaluators felt they knew least about selecting, administering, and interpreting psychological tests.

4. Hoffman (in Pruitt and Pacinelli, EDS 1969) reports a study designed to determine what training needed to be provided to evaluators. The 189 respondents indicated a desire for more knowledge on work methods and job sampling, the vocational rehabilitation process, medical and psychological aspects of disability, report writing, counseling theory, communication skills, occupational information and analysis, contract procurement procedures, psychological testing, community resources, and information about the world of work. He further reports that in workshops held at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, evaluators accuracy, manual

dexterity, knowledge of common machines, tools and shop equipment, counseling and interviewing skills, supervisory skills, teaching and training skills, organizational ability, interpersonal relations skills, communications skills, research principles, methodology and statistics, job analysis, and manpower needs.

5. Although a number of knowledges and skills can and have been identified in Vocational Evaluation, there is some evidence (Nadolsky, 1971) that evaluators with different education-work backgrounds attach different degrees of significance to tools and techniques within the field. What kinds of experiences have led evaluators toward common methodology, and what differences exist, and why? What training or background is the most beneficial in order to become an evaluator, and what have the different disciplines from which evaluators have evolved contributed to the knowledge and skills we possess? Sankovsky (1971) found that 87% of the polled evaluators in his study had a bachelor's degree, and 40% had done some graduate work. Educational backgrounds most often reported were in industrial arts, psychology, sociology and social science, and occupational therapy.

6. As mentioned, evaluators have brought an enormous variety of work and educational backgrounds to the field. It is interesting to observe, however, that vocational evaluators in every area have found like difficulties to overcome, and have moved in similar directions in developing the kinds of expertise to overcome the obstacles. It is likely that some of the excellent information distributing processes available in the field have increased the rate of consolidation of definable knowledges and skills. This is not to imply there are not divergent viewpoints or methodologies, however, it is striking to note the similarity of processes occurring in a career area in the infancy of its existence. It would seem appropriate in discussing vocational evaluators knowledges and skills to examine the performance competencies of the best among us, for their demonstrated abilities will reflect the knowledges possessed and the skill areas necessary to do the job. Due to the multivaried settings of vocational evaluation services, it is necessary to include equally the gamut of performance competencies which might be utilized to a greater or lesser degree dependent on the purposes of different programs. This accounting of performances of the competent evaluator is for organizational purposes, structured under the areas of tools and techniques, vocational information, communications and interpersonal relationships, mental and physical processes, and a miscellaneous category.

7. In the area of Tools and Techniques, evaluators commonly demonstrate knowledge about the types of evaluation methods available to them, and understand the strengths and weaknesses of those with which they work. Within the framework of the assessment procedures they have available to them, they can select, administer, and interpret the ones necessary for an individual evaluation program. They have some comprehension of the selection and administration of psychological tests, and are adept in the interpretation of these instruments. They have the skills to gather data from industrial sources, and the imagination to create a work sample which challenges the evaluatee to perform at his best, in relation to the industrial requirement. They are familiar with the tools commonly used in industry, and can give instruction relative to their use. They have the ability to develop orientation procedures, basic skills tests, and follow-up procedures. They can do a job analysis. They can objectively measure physical capacities, and they can appropriately outline adjustment objectives.

8. Within the area of Vocational Information, vocational evaluators understand how to provide and use occupational information such as the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Occupational Briefs, and the Occupational Outline Handbook. Evaluators comprehend the meaning of work in the American society, and they have some knowledge of vocational development theories. These effective evaluators have methods they use in understanding the job market, and they know where to get current information on the prevailing conditions. They know the jobs available within their community, and they understand the job skills required in these jobs.

9. In the area of Communications and Interpersonal Relationships, a good evaluator demonstrates an understanding of his own personality dynamics and can accurately perceive the behavior of his clients. He has the ability to demonstrate interest and concern for the client and relate to him on his own level. He can conduct meaningful initial and exit interviews and carry on a counseling relationship when needed. The vocational evaluator is skilled at supervising others and in teaching techniques. He understands the jargon of his field and can effectively, completely, factually, and concisely communicate the results of evaluation both orally and in written form. He is able to handle public relation duties in selling his program, and he has an understanding of the roles of other rehabilitation workers. He is able to relate professionally with these workers in situations such as the staff conference.

10. Within the Mental and Physical Process category, the vocational evaluator can demonstrate knowledge of the disabling aspects of medical conditions. He understands normal bodily functions as well. He has learned personality development theories, and has developed an identification with at least one such theory.

11. Falling within the miscellaneous category, an evaluator has a knowledge of the history, development, and future trends in rehabilitation and vocational evaluation. He is familiar with the philosophies of vocational evaluation, and he has an understanding of the total rehabilitation process. He understands the VEWA code of ethics and abides by it. He has organizational skills, knowledge of available community resources, and the ability to maintain acceptable case records.

12. These performance competency areas represent where we are now in vocational evaluation. Reflected are the rather limited areas we have invaded or created and made our field of knowledge and skills. There are likely minor exclusions in the listing, but few will argue the necessity of vocational evaluators demonstrating proficiency in the areas listed.

13. We are witnessing the movement of vocational evaluation from its beginnings to a definable entity as a profession in human services. It is exciting to be a part of this movement and observe the practitioners pushing not only for more knowledge to assist them in their efforts, but also exploring new frontiers where they are discovering their new found expertise in demand. Although born in the rehabilitation movement in America, the course is set for expansion into areas such as vocational education, manpower, public schools, welfare, guidance, and life skills assessment and adjustment. This field is not only the happening place to be, but will also heavily contribute to where we are headed in the human race. As we expand and explore the limits of our professional abilities, it will be up to you the clinician, researcher, educator, administrator, or supporter of this becoming profession to create and discover the necessary theoretical framework, training opportunities, new technology, and performance skills, to make vocational evaluation all that it can be. It is a challenging task. How can you contribute?

TRAINING

1. Vocational evaluation has been in existence for many years. However, only recently attempts have been made to establish a formal profession: vocational evaluation. In the early stages vocational evaluation was not considered a significant part of the rehabilitation process except for a select few of the severely physically disabled. With the increased awareness of vocational evaluation and the emphasis placed on rehabilitation facilities in the 1965 Amendments of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, a sudden demand for vocational evaluators developed. Formal training programs had not previously existed. Training was mainly confined to the visitation of one or more existing facilities. During the visitation, work samples or evaluation materials were gathered, carted home, and an evaluation unit was established. It is safe to say that this procedure was inadequate at best.

2. The demands for technical expertise have resulted in the establishment of training workshops and graduate and undergraduate training programs. These programs are still limited in number and there is still a deficit of professionally trained personnel in the field. It is also plagued by the growing pains of a new profession and the uncertainty as to what the qualifications and demands of the field should be. Even though training programs have been established, it has been difficult to get evaluators to these training programs or the training programs to the evaluators. Administrators are reluctant to release evaluators for formal training, since there is a short supply, and administrators are concerned with delivery of daily evaluation services to the client. This reluctance has further deterred the acquisition of the training for development of techniques and procedures deemed necessary in the profession.

BACKGROUND

3. The technical knowledge needed by the vocational evaluator was exemplified by the participants of a "think tank" workshop on work evaluation conducted at Stout State University (1969). Participants listed the following competencies and skills as being a necessary part of the knowledge of the vocational evaluator.

Ability to:	Knowledge of:
Develop work samples	Theory of work evaluation
Administer work samples	The DOT
Conduct on-the-job assessment	Work characteristics
Administer psychological tests	Occupational information
Conduct job analysis	Medical aspects of disability
Write brochures	Psychological aspects of disability
	The total process of rehabilitation
	The principles of philosophy of rehabilitation
	Adjustive aspects of disabilities
	Community resources
	Personnel management
	Evaluation of special disability groups

Articles pertaining to evaluator training are quite limited, but most educators agree that there is a need for training in the competencies as outlined above.

4. Despite this identified need for technical knowledge, a study by Sankovsky (1971) revealed that only 60% of 300 VEWA members surveyed had received any formal training. This study went on to point out that 87% had received at least a Bachelor's Degree, and 43% had some graduate work. Of the evaluator group with degrees, 27% reported backgrounds not traditionally associated with rehabilitation, 27% had backgrounds in Industrial Arts, 5% reported a psychology background, and 25% reported a sociology or a social science background. The study also revealed that 75% of the evaluator group read the VEWA Bulletin, and that 80% had attended professional conferences within the past two years, primarily at the State level. Only 60% of the evaluator group reported receiving at least 3 weeks of in-service training.
5. Attempts have been made to provide training which practicing evaluators identify as needed. Ralph Church (1971) alluded to the regional short-term institutes designed to allow an exchange of ideas and information as they apply to problems within a region. In 1965 and 1966, the Institute on Rehabilitation Services (IRS) gave an intensive effort to evaluation and work adjustment. The purpose was to define problems that develop solutions, so that better services might be provided to the disabled.
6. IRS in 1972 conducted a study entitled, Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Service in Vocational Rehabilitation. The purpose of the Prime Study Group was to develop materials to be used in training counselors and other rehabilitation personnel in the effective selection and utilization of vocational evaluation, and work adjustment service in rehabilitation facilities. Since material defines the essential elements of vocational evaluation and work adjustment, the manual might be used in planning facility staff training programs.
7. Other training has been developed in the form of in-service training. One such program was initiated at Auburn University. In this program, the Rehabilitation Education and Services staff of Auburn University conducted a "mock" accreditation survey of all the rehabilitation facilities in Alabama. The purpose of this survey was to determine how close the facilities were to meeting CARF's standards, and to determine areas of deficiencies and ways to correct these deficiencies. Facility administrators and state agency staff were brought together in small groups to plan program objectives they would like to see implemented into their facilities. Following the identification of objectives, the service staff members of each facility were brought together, and plans were made for the implementation of the objectives. The Auburn staff then visited each facility to give assistance in deficient areas, and to insure that the objectives were implemented. This approach seems valid in that it provides assistance and training in areas of individual need.
8. Some practitioners question the totality of classroom work in training vocational evaluators and adjusters. Paul Lustig (1961) stated, "One can learn to administer and interpret various different kinds of aptitude, ability, interest, and personality tests. One can learn to become more aware of an increasing number of factors in the person. There may, however, be some aspects of evaluation that cannot be taught directly, but rather may require the experience of working, both as an evaluator and in other occupations." He further states, "The person who has been a student or who has held one or two jobs is probably less able to evaluate than the one who has had several jobs." He feels that the evaluator should have "adequate competencies" in several job skills. "Since the predictive ability of most instruments is rather low, the evaluator with little or non-varied work experience must depend in a large part on the objective measuring instruments or his biases, which result from lack of work experience."

9. In carrying the work idea further, Minnesota Metropolitan State College has established a degree program without a central or formal campus. The major portion of this staff consists of people who are not responsible to the college. The program utilized rehabilitation facilities as learning laboratories and rehabilitation workers as faculty. The training takes place where the action is.

10. The need for both theory and practical experience is exemplified by the three Universities offering degrees in vocational evaluation. Auburn, Arizona, and the University of Wisconsin-Stout, provide for the learning of theory as well as the application of this theory in a practical work setting within University-operated evaluation and adjustment facilities.

ISSUES

11. In regard to education, I feel that there is a need for both practical (vocational) and formal (academic) training. Although formal training may be ideal, I do not see an evaluator completing an evaluation of a person's skills in a technical trade without having some working knowledge of that trade. On the other hand, the person without the academic training may have difficulty in expressing himself, or in understanding the variety of disciplines and knowledges encountered in providing rehabilitation services. The key to this problem seems to be the blending of appropriate, practical, and formal training through formal education, short-term institutes, practical work experience, on-the-job training, and/or in-service training.

12. This then brings up the problem of the availability of adequate practical and formal training. The formal training programs are few and can accommodate only limited numbers of trainees. These programs try to accommodate short-term training programs and institutes, but, again, they are limited by the number of evaluators that can participate. Few facilities have enough adequately trained staff to conduct in-house, in-service training. This could be offset by the Universities providing technical consultation and materials to assist facilities in conducting in-house, in-service training. For those states who have a VEWA Chapter, much training can be accomplished through this Organization. As the VEWA programs are presented on a regional or national basis, the content of the program tends to become more general and does not necessarily meet the specific needs of individuals. Even with the establishment of these training programs, the problem of the evaluators being freed to attend still exists.

13. Those individuals completing formal training programs in evaluation should obtain a great amount of theoretical knowledge. Unfortunately, too many of these people, because of the shortage of advanced degree personnel, are placed in positions of administration and supervision and never get involved in evaluation. This hinders their ability to act as trainers for other staff. It also reduces their effectiveness by not allowing the practical experience necessary in combination with formal training.

14. Practice and training should be based on theory. There is, however, some question as to whether there is a universally-accepted theory or body of knowledge in vocational evaluation. Without this, can effective training programs be developed?

15. Assuming that there is an accepted theory and that training programs are developed around these theories, there is still a problem of implementing this knowledge to the everyday problems encountered in vocational evaluation.

16. Today, three Universities are offering degree programs in vocational evaluation. Their curricula include the teaching of theory and the opportunity to

implement this theory in rehabilitation facilities located on the campuses. This approach seems to have at least two advantages: It allows the student (1) an opportunity to test the theories he has learned in the classroom and (2) to have immediate consultation from the University staff when problems arise in the "real world" of vocational evaluation.

17. Although formal training is ideal, the actual implementation of the theories and ideas is something else. Too often we forget that we are working with clients with individual problems and under individual circumstances. Because of this, I feel that a good training program, whether it be formal or in-service, should consist of both text book theory and an on-the-job practicum.

18. There have been studies and surveys in the past that have disclosed the training level of evaluators -- what resources they turn to for professional upgrading and what they see as training needs. Because of the rapid expansion of evaluation and the recent emphasis on research, a constant re-evaluation of the training needs, training practicum, and required level of training needs to be done. With this in mind, the following are some questions that need to be considered:

- 1) What is the current training level of the evaluators? What type of training have they had? Is there a need for formal training? If not, why not? If so, support your convictions. Is it necessary to be trained in the field in which you are doing evaluations or is general theory sufficient? How many evaluators have a college degree? How many have an advanced degree or advanced training? In what field?
- 2) What theories is the evaluator utilizing in the practice of his "art"? What should be included in the training of an evaluator to meet today's needs and tomorrow's challenges? Who should be responsible for the training of evaluators? The Departments of HEW, Labor, or State; State; the individual, or the University? Should training lead to the certification of an evaluator? How many evaluators attended short-term seminars?
- 3) What use has been made of training materials and self-help? How many have had an opportunity to take a summer or a month off to participate in a training program and, how many of these have received tuition or part salary during the training program?
- 4) Does the average Evaluator read the VEWA Bulletin and other periodicals published on evaluation? Does he participate in local forums and/or professional rehabilitation or inter-agency, inter-disciplinary sessions? Does his facility offer in-service training sessions? How is the content of the training sessions determined?
- 5) What are the best training experiences? How does this training relate to the job Vocational Evaluators are doing? What are the areas in which Evaluators feel the most inadequate or most in need of training?

19. This paper was originally intended to be a stimulant to discussion by the local forums involved in the VEWA Project. It was their challenge to create a statement regarding the reality of their training, both formal and experimental. Identification of the type and extent of training needed by the evaluator remains a challenge to practitioners if the profession of vocational evaluation is to continue to develop and improve.

1. Vocational or work evaluation is the process that attempts to assess and predict vocational potential and behavior through the use of various techniques and methods. The objective is to accurately place the client in an appropriate vocational setting by correctly assessing his interests, performance, and behavior. The methods (tools) commonly associated with work evaluation are: (1) on-the-job tryout or evaluation; (2) production or "situational" evaluation (although the "situational" approach has been used to define subcontract evaluation, I feel this is an inappropriate term to use in this context); (3) psychological testing; and (4) work sampling. These methods are used to provide settings where evaluation of the multiple factors associated with the assessment of a client's potential for the world of work can be made. The work evaluator, weighing the advantages and disadvantages of each method, would probably use any combination which best suits his purposes.

2. Of the four methods used in evaluating work potential, the most realistic would be evaluating clients in an actual work situation since the closer the testing method is to the real situation we are measuring, the better. The best testing method or evaluation for a job then would be the job itself. In such a setting, all the working conditions and environment would be actual, and we could readily assess how the client functions in a real job. However, using the "on-the-job" method without some form of prevocational evaluation would be, a hit and miss effort, time consuming and frustrating for the client, employer, and the evaluator. Since the efficiency of this method is optimized when it follows some other method of screening, today more thought is being given to using this method after initial prevocational evaluation is made. Despite the fact that the literature states that job sites are difficult to find, and that this method is expensive, programs using the "on-the-job" evaluation method have reported excellent results. Since the appraisal of a client doing an actual job in industry also offers us an evaluation of the effectiveness of our other assessment techniques and judgements, it can be a valuable criteria for judging these other techniques.

3. The production or situational approach to evaluation is the method of evaluating clients through the use of subcontracts in a sheltered workshop. The client is evaluated on actual industrial work brought into the workshop on a subcontract basis. By observing the client in this setting, the evaluator could gain insight into the client's potential for work. In this setting, wages are paid to the client for work on actual commodities. The main difference between the "on-the-job" and production approaches is the ability to vary all the customary conditions of the real job in the rehabilitation setting in an effort to discover difficulties that prevent the client from working effectively. Problems with this method have resulted from the ineffectual way it has been applied, and not with the method itself (I think this can be safely stated with all four of the evaluation methods). Sheltered workshops can be criticized for being too permissive, for not setting up an industrial environment, and for not setting up the contracts in an industrial fashion. All too often the work atmosphere in a sheltered workshop bears faint relationship to the atmosphere in an actual industrial setting. These criticisms could be corrected by using better methodology in order to organize the workshop as much like an industrial setting as possible. One legitimate drawback to the production method is that the types of work available for client evaluation are restricted to the contracts that can be obtained from industry.

4. The method that has drawn the most criticism, as an evaluation approach, is psychological testing. Of the four evaluation methods, psychological testing is the most removed from assessing ability for those jobs that we consider feasible for the type of client normally seen in rehabilitation facilities. This is due to the fact that psychological tests often measure cognitive abilities, rather than the psychomotor abilities which are related more closely to most industrial settings. Also the psychological testing method is ineffective in evaluating a large minority of the disabled population who have low literacy levels and have had unsatisfactory experiences with such tests in school. Psychological tests in themselves are not an ineffective method of evaluation. It is the improper use of the tests, not the tests themselves, which may cause the problem. If the traits measured by the test are clearly understood, and the limitations and skills necessary for taking the test are adequately considered, then the evaluator should be capable of judging the appropriateness of the instrument in question.

5. Since the work sample is a sample of work based upon a job analysis of the industrial operation, the fourth method -- the work sample should approximate real life jobs more closely than psychological testing. The work sample should simulate the complete range of work activities, (motions, mental functioning, performance demands, operations, materials and equipment used) that comprise a particular job or occupational area. The objectives in using a work sample are to assess and determine job skill potentials and, to a degree, work relevant behaviors. These can be accomplished to the extent that the work sample does not differ in its essentials from the kinds of activities a potential worker would be required to perform in an actual industrial job. The work sample can be the actual job itself, (job sample) or a close simulation or mock-up of the actual industrial operation. There have been efforts to develop trait samples, (finger and manual dexterity, eye-hand coordination, color discrimination, etc.) but so far the trait samples have shown little face validity for actual jobs.

6. The suitability of a given job area for work sample development should be a function of: (a) whether a job market exists for the job which the sample tends to assess and (b) whether the requisite skills required for the job area are possessed by the intended client group. In principle, all work samples should represent the complete range of activities and components that have been abstracted from an actual job. The developer of a work sample should start with a detailed job analysis of all the industrial operations, conditions, and activities of the job that he wishes to predict. In developing the work sample, all the work activities, materials, tools, layout, and physical conditions should be maintained as close to the actual job as possible. It is important that the work sample involve reading and other cognitive skills, only to the extent that such skills are called for, during on-the-job performance. Instead of work samples being designed and used to assess abilities for a single job, we should attempt to make them as broad as possible in application, by extending validation efforts, to a multitude of job situations sharing a common basis of similar activities.

7. Many requests have been made for information on work samples designed for specific disability groups, such as mentally retarded, blind, disadvantaged, welfare recipients, etc. I do not feel that any work sample should, or even could, be designed for a given disability group for the following reasons: (a) the purpose of work evaluation in relation to vocational rehabilitation is to evaluate people for "real", "actual" jobs, regardless of the disabilities involved. If a realistic job exists where accommodations can be made for given disabilities, then those accommodations should automatically be included in a valid sample of that job; (b) we must concentrate on what the client can and cannot do and not on the "disability label" he may be wearing; and (c) the admonition that we should not specifically design work samples for given disability groups would not preclude identifying job areas and/or job samples which have proven, or may prove in the future, useful with different disability groups. The work sample is a sample of actual work. It is designed and developed so that it will enable an individual, regardless of his disability, to be assessed for a job or a group of jobs.

8. The major advantages for the work sample method include: (a) the work sample (developed by job analysis) is as close to the reality of work as we can get within the rehabilitation facility (except for actually putting clients to work in the facility); (b) it provides exposure and experience on a wide range of jobs; (c) performance identical to work is required on the assumption that the closer the work sample is to the criterion, the more likely it is to be valid; (d) it not only assesses skills, but reveals aspects of the client's personality, interest, motivation, and attitudes towards the job; (e) clients respond more naturally to meaningful rather than abstract tasks; (f) it can eliminate cultural, educational, and language barriers in the assessment of vocational potential; and (g) many prospective employers are more receptive to utilization of work sample performance than predilections from other sources.

9. Some of the disadvantages for the work sample method include: (a) work samples tend to emphasize quality and quantity of production, rather than personality factors; (b) developing work samples for the many different types of jobs in the labor market is unfeasible; (c) workers are part of a working, social family - and the social experience, reactions from co-workers, heat, noise, motivation, and wages vary so considerably in our shops that there is little comparison between the environment in industry and the work sample method; (d) we're really not measuring the actual job; (e) because work technological change is so rapid, we run the risk of developing a good appraisal instrument for jobs which no longer exist; and (f) work samples have not often used statistical methods to develop reliability and validity information.

10. If a work sample is to represent an actual sample of work in industry, certain considerations would have to be made in developing the sample. First, one would need to decide on the job that the sample is supposed to represent. In observing the job, a job analysis would have to be performed to make sure that all the elements, components, and traits of the work are understood and replicated. It is only by this process that we will know what samples of work are inherent in the job, and to understand what we are measuring. So often, from my experience, when you ask an evaluator what the work sample he is administering actually measures, he cannot tell you this. I feel that is extremely important in a work sample to be able to identify and know what it is

you are measuring. Second, how does what you are measuring actually relate to jobs in industry. The primary way of accomplishing this with a work sample would be to actually do a job analysis and develop a work sample as close to, if not identically to, the job that you are analyzing. It is understood that the total environmental conditions that the job is performed under cannot be simulated, but the actual work performed can be. This should be the first consideration in developing the job sample or work sample. The work sample should be able to show some empirical data demonstrating that the sample, used correctly, measures some skill, aptitude, knowledge, or characteristics which are relevant to the job in question. This will only occur when (a) the job analysis presents a truly accurate relection of the actual job, and (b) the work sample has content validity with reference to the job analysis. Therefore, the work sample itself will be predictive of, or significantly correlated with, important elements of work behavior which are related to the job. Evaluators have failed to realize that their work sample tasks may be rather narrow, and have no resemblance to how the work is performed in industry by the employed worker.

11. For effective use of any work sample, a manual is required. First, it serves as an informational training aid for evaluators previously unfamiliar with the sample. Second, standardized administration procedures become difficult, if not impossible, without a manual offering uniform procedures for administration, utilization, and interpretation. In order to maximize its benefits, the work sample manual should contain complete administrative instructions for the evaluator. These would include: (a) complete list of all materials, tools and parts needed for the sample; (b) information pertaining to where to purchase any items needed if the items are not available locally; (c) detailed instructions and diagrams as to how to build and set up the sample; and (d) any additional special instructions to the evaluator that would assist in the setting up of this work sample (or even possibly the environment) as it was designed to be performed in industry. The above information is absolutely necessary since, if, industrial norms (or any norms) are provided with the sample, any change in layout, materials, or any component of the sample's original design, will invalidate these norms. Norms should be based on administration of the sample in the exact manner designated by the instructions.

12. Instructions given to a client, prior to his beginning a work sample, serve three major purposes. The first purpose of client instruction is to orient the client to the relevance of the work sample for jobs in the community. Too often, a client is given a work sample with no explanation of what is being assessed, or how such assessment can be meaningful to the client in his vocational exploration. This orientation should enable the client to perceive the relationship between the task he is to perform and the occupational area it represents. An audiovisual presentation with the use of videotapes, slides, or filmstrips can be very effective in accomplishing this first purpose. The presentation should include a statement of the purpose of administering the sample and, if possible, pictures showing the job being performed in industry and other similar work settings in industry and other similar work settings in industry, for which the results of the work sample is relevant. It would be helpful to have, in this presentation, information as to salaries, working conditions, and the future employment market for the job that the work sample relates to. If visual presentation is not feasible, the introduction to the sample can be either audio taped or printed, and used in conjunction with photographs of the jobs being performed in actual industrial settings.

13. A second purpose of client instruction is to instruct him (the client) as to what he is to do and how he is to do it, exactly as these instructions would be given to him in industry. This first involves an analysis of how industrial employees are instructed to perform the operation on which the work sample is based. The purpose there is to find out if the client can perform the task, based upon the instructions as they would actually be given by industry. These instructions could be standardized and could easily lend themselves to an audiovisual presentation. It might even be a more effective and realistic method to have the foreman in the industry, where the work sample was developed, put the instructions on tape and use this as the standardized instructions for the client.

14. A third purpose of client instruction is to aid in the assessment of how well the client can learn to do the task if he does not perform adequately following the standardized industrial instruction. If the client cannot perform the task from the standardized industrial instruction, we must then determine what type(s) of instruction will facilitate the client's understanding of the task to be performed in the work sample. Some clients may need repeated instruction, with a great deal of demonstration, while others learn by imitation, where the evaluator does each step of the process, and the client then imitates each step following the evaluator's example. This phase of the client instruction can both convey to the client what he is to do and, how and while doing this, assess the learning abilities of the client. The client's ability to learn, his retention and most efficient means of attaining learning, must always remain separate from the assessment of performance. In this context, learning ability and performance ability can both be measured by the work sample. The criterion for deciding that the client understands the instructions, on any work sample, is the performance of the sample correctly a given number of times.

15. Once the client has demonstrated his ability to perform the work sample, we can then measure his performance. A basic problem in the utilization of work samples has been how to relate the client's performance to some known objective, or standard of performance. Realistically, we should compare the client's performance on the work sample to the actual industrial production level, to determine if the client's abilities are competitive. If the work sample is constructed from existing work in industry, it should be relatively easy to get both quality and quantity standards from the job itself. These standards can then be utilized to compare the client's productivity with those of workers in industry. When comparing a client with industrial standards, it should be noted that the person in industry has had experience in doing the task. To compensate for this fact, the client should be allowed to practice the work sample (as many times as necessary) until it can be determined whether or not the client can achieve an industrial competitive level.

16. It has been my perception that client norms are limited in their usefulness. With the use of client norms, all you can compare a client with is another client. We should remember that our major goal in rehabilitation is to place the client in a "real" job. If we are interested in assessing a client for jobs in the community, we must then have industrial norms. One meaningful use of client norms would be to assess the client for jobs within a sheltered workshop, which would require that some comparison be made between clients. An alternate way of constructing industrial norms, in addition to measuring the productivity of people actually on the job, (which I feel is

probably the most effective way of getting norms) would be to use the services of industrial engineers who can develop industrial norms, using predetermined times. Industrial engineers analyze any job, and can determine by the measurement of all motions, in this job, how long it should take an experienced person in industry to complete the task. Once the industrial norm is developed, the literature indicates that a client, who can reach approximately 70 to 75% of this industrial norm, should have the minimum qualifications for obtaining a job in that industry.

17. For evaluation to be effective, we need to evaluate the whole person. Our evaluations of the client's abilities, skills, and interest alone are not enough. Many attributes of the client, presently not measured in any quantitative way, are more determinant of employability than the above measurable attributes. These include motivation, vocational self-concept, relations with supervisors and co-workers, initiative, ability to accept criticism, attention span, physical stamina, emotional maturity, and the ability to improve in any of these attributes. Scoring and observation of performance on work tasks can provide leads to many personal qualities of possible relevance to particular jobs. These work attitudes and behaviors are often more crucial to an individual's acquiring and holding a job in industry than such factors as ability to follow directions, tool usage and work method. At this point, we are trying to assess what behaviors become evident that we feel will stop a person from performing satisfactorily in the world of work, while working in a simulated work situation. We should realize that since the environment of an evaluation center does differ from an actual work setting, the behaviors of the client during the evaluation process may not accurately reflect eventual job-related behaviors. Due to close supervision during evaluation, a client may demonstrate test anxiety behaviors that would not appear during later performance on the job. Many evaluators, in the field, feel that this affective, subjective, behavioral evaluation is probably the most significant part of the total evaluation. There are numerous studies which indicate that it is not the client's inability to perform on the task which gets him fired from a job, but his inability to adjust to the work environment.

18. By and large personal qualities or behavior characteristics revealed by the use of work tasks are generally subjectively determined by evaluators. The quality of the appraisal, in regard to behavior characteristics, depends upon the depth of the evaluator's psychological insight and his ability to communicate his observations to others either orally or in writing. As stated previously, the area of vocational evaluation that many evaluators consider to be the most crucial is dealing with behaviors and attitudes in relation to the world of work. Many evaluation units are primarily interested in the client's work habits and social relationships, rather than job skills or potentials. There is, however, eventually a need to determine the client's specific skills and potentials for ultimate employment. It is highly questionable whether the success of vocational evaluation is due to: (a) the methods used for evaluation; (b) the competency of the evaluator; or (c) the evaluator's ability to relate to the client and handle daily adjustment problems. Training programs should prepare educators to obtain more accurate observations and perceptions of the client's social-psychological framework with reference to the world of work.

19. The major purpose of work evaluation is to serve the client, and to provide him with the insights, self-understanding, and information so that he can make his own vocational and life decisions more realistically. This is why the evaluation setting and methods used should be as realistically set up as possible to emulate a work setting. This reality orientation will then enable the client to perceive the relationship of the tasks they are performing to the occupational areas of the world of work. This aspect of making the evaluative process "face-valid" is extremely important in maintaining the client's morale and cooperation. In this regard, it would be helpful even if the client could be paid (on an industrial scale) for the work he is doing. It is possible that some clients are affected by financial incentives more than others. The absence of incentive in work sample testing would elicit performances from these individuals which are inferior to their performances under incentive conditions. The above mentioned problems could be solved by an orientation which describes how the sample relates to actual jobs in industry, the use of performance charts, and, possibly, incentive pay to show the client how he compares on an actual skill level to people in that industry. The main theme of work-sample-based vocational evaluation was and remains the enhancement of individual exploration and self-discovery.

20. The above paragraphs dealing with work samples have tried to come to grips with making work samples more meaningful for evaluation, and for the client to be able to better evaluate and understand himself. The charge to the forums involved with this paper is:

1. Your comments, either agreeing or disagreeing, on the views expressed and other views you feel should be stated to help in improving the work sample method.
2. The degree to which you feel the viewpoints expressed in this paper reflect the substance and utilization of work samples, as they are being used in work evaluation.
3. Your cooperation in submitting work samples that you have developed to the Materials Development Center, University of Wisconsin - Stout, Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751, so that these can be shared with other evaluators throughout the country.

ARNOLD SAX

1. Traditionally, work samples have been utilized with populations for which valid measurement with paper and pencil tests is unobtainable. These groups may be low in verbal and reading skills, test shy, or unable to relate to standard testing situations for any number of reasons. Work Samples are not usually administered to individuals who obviously lack vocational problems. These individuals can be assessed by a variety of readily available paper and pencil tests.

2. Performance, behavior, and interest are generally considered to be significant factors in vocational assessment. It is possible to arrive at conclusions about them through either intuitive or measurable techniques. The Philadelphia JEVS has established empirical norms for their twenty-eight work samples which have been used in a variety of settings. Because of the standardization of administration and objectivity in scoring, performance can be quantified. However, it is considerably more difficult to obtain an objective assessment of behavior and interest. The prevailing tendency is to have behavior and interest assessed, in a subjective manner, by an evaluator who is usually trained to make reliable observations and conclusions, in these areas. Validity, nevertheless, remains an unknown quality. What has been done to produce objective measures of interest and behavior? A review of research, in this area, yields no significant studies which attest to the predictive validity of interest and behavior measures collected during work sample evaluation. Yet, virtually every system of work sample evaluation provides information regarding behavior and interest. Attempts have been made to quantify behavior and interest with check lists and standardized observation, but successful results have yet to be reported. This is a problem in all contemporary work sample evaluation techniques.

3. Use of work samples in public manpower programs is a more recent innovation. The main body of work-sample research has dealt with performance norms. Review of the literature indicates not only continuing concern regarding performance norms, but also points out an increasing need for truly objective reports of behavior and interest. When questioned about their need for this information, counselors in work-sample facilities throughout the country stressed its importance in placing clients on the proper job.

4. Work samples are an evaluative technique, and not designed to produce a significant change in the individual being assessed. Their objective is the measurement of performance, interest, and behavior in order to accomplish the goal of accurately placing the client in an appropriate vocational area, whether it be employment, training, or the next step in a process of vocational development.

5. Deviations from standardized administration and scoring of work samples have the effect of reducing their value as an assessment device. These deviations may affect performance, interest, and behavior, either separately or in some combination. If, for instance, a client's performance is discussed with him after completing a work sample, it may have an effect upon subsequent work samples.

6. Another deviation is the labeling of the work samples, during the instructions given to the enrollee, as "boring" or "repetitious". This labeling could negatively influence the client in the development of his own feelings about the work sample. Different people view the same work sample in different ways. What is frustrating or boring to one individual may not be frustrating or boring to another.

7. A third deviation, and one that is frequently requested by counselors everywhere, is administration of the work sample battery in parts rather than in its

entirety. This is hazardous, unless validated for partial (cluster) use, since work samples were standardized as a complete battery, not as individual units with no effect upon one another. What may be appropriate norms for a work sample in a battery may not be appropriate for the same work sample when given alone.

8. It is also important, however, that work sample practitioners be flexible. The Philadelphia JEVS has investigated changes in the work sample battery as used in manpower systems. For instance, in order to better evaluate marginal skills, it might be advisable to establish a procedure for re-administering failed work samples. Such a procedure which could lead to better knowledge of the individual's true skills would be analogous to the situation in industry, where an individual is not expected to learn the job requirements in one try. Of course, any change in work-sample procedures would come about as a result of empirical validation and comparison, with existing procedures.

9. The most accurate assessment technique is of no value unless utilized effectively. The factors mentioned earlier -- performance, interest, and behavior -- are useful to the counselor only prior to an important vocational decision. Consequently, the chronological integration of work samples into the total assessment process is crucial. For example, in some Manpower programs, the employability development plan was drawn up before the client was fully assessed. This resulted in failure to change the plan when necessary, and the client was not properly served.

10. Work Sample information must be provided to the counselor in job related terms, rather than in psychological constructs, which may not be sufficiently understood. Job related information is more familiar to the counselor, and will better enable him to analyze the client's vocational potential. In order to best utilize vocational information provided by work samples, the counselor should be well trained in the basic processes of work sample evaluation. Because work samples do not exist in a vacuum, they must be related to some system, which the counselor must also know. For example, the Philadelphia JEVS Work Sample System is directly related to the Worker Trait Group Arrangements of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. If the counselor is not familiar with this classification scheme, the evaluation is worth significantly less to him. Also, work-sample information should be presented in a manner which is relevant to the vocational opportunities in the local labor market area. It would serve no purpose for work-sample evaluators to recommend areas of training or placement which are non-existent in the local economy.

11. Although many centers have attempted to develop work samples that elicit specific behavioral acts, none have been entirely successful. The major factor in this lack of success seems to be that people react differently to different stimuli, and even to the same stimuli at different times. What is frustrating to one individual may not be frustrating to another. Another significant problem is that an individual work sample may be non-predictive of future behavior. It might take many work samples to determine if the client has a behavioral characteristic, which is a significant part of his vocational profile.

12. Performance on work samples is easier to measure than interest and behavior. The Philadelphia JEVS has developed standardized techniques for scoring the performance of work samples. It is easily demonstrated that a string in the "Washer Threading" sample is one inch long plus or minus 1/8", or that the "Lock Assemble" sample either works or doesn't. Thus, client A performs at the 30th, 50th or 99th percentile, and receives a scaled score appropriate to his performance. This scaled score reflects his relative standing within the population.

13. What is sorely needed is the ability to predict industrial performance from work sample information. This ability remains elusive because of the lack of industrial criteria. A rigorous predictive study relating work sample performance to industrial criteria must be done in order to achieve this end.

14. At least two types of measurement may be used to validate behavioral data. The first is the check list upon which the evaluator can indicate the occurrence of behavior. This system has obvious drawbacks. Foremost among which is the possibility that the event may go unnoticed. The checklist also has the weakness of misinterpretation. For example, that which appears to have been caused by "frustration", and may, in reality, be imputed to hunger or even such problems as poor coordination. The second method of validating behavioral measurements will be to seek the products of the behavior in the form of completed work samples. Little has been done in this area, but it is conceivable that a man may produce a product which will be influenced by his "inner states". In our experience, we have all seen products of frustrated workers. Every work sample evaluator has struggled to take apart an assembled product after an angry client has taken out his aggression on it.

15. The problems in assessing interest neatly parallel those of behavior. For example, if a man has a particular interest today, what does that predict about his future? The questions are: How reliably can you measure what we call vocational interest? How stable is interest? In work samples, interest is usually measured in a subjective manner. There are few among us who would want to abandon the skilled subjective evaluation which invariably occurs during work sample assessment. Many claim that such data are most important because of their salience in determining vocational placement. But can interest be measured reliably, and if so, how can this be accomplished?

HAROLD V. KULMAN

SITUATIONAL ASSESSMENT*

1. Situational assessment is one of the most widely used vocational evaluation techniques. However, there is no standard, uniformly accepted definition for the term "situational assessment." Neff (1966, 1968, 1970, 1971), for example, defines the situational approach as being "...aimed at work behavior in general..." rather than assessment of "...specific work skills...". Roberts (1969) and Sankovsky (1969) hold a similar view of situational assessment as focused upon the work personality and work behavior of the individual.
2. Pruitt (1971), on the other hand, has defined situational assessment as a "...systematic procedure for observing, recording, and interpreting work behavior...". Miller (1968) and the Study Group on Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment services (1972) similarly emphasize situational assessment as a systematic observation technique.
3. Neither of these conceptualizations, however, really seem to provide an answer to the question "What is situational assessment?" The best answer to this question has been provided by Button and Miller (1972), who base their statement on actual observed situational assessment practices in several rehabilitation facilities.

The essence of situational assessment is that the client is placed in a real (though controlled) work situation where, under close supervision of trained evaluators, he works with other employees on contract jobs for real wages. In this setting evaluators can observe the client in a variety of situations and analyze and interpret his response. For example, tasks assigned to subjects, their physical location relative to other workers, the amount and style of supervision, level of financial remuneration, and a wide variety of other critically significant social and technological aspects can be varied.... The purpose of such an environment is to enable those concerned with evaluation to vary systematically the elements of the work situation and thus provide concrete behavioral evidence of the problems clients have in adjusting to work settings.... It is possible for sensitized observers to systematically gather data about client's performance and yet, these data are not always used.... Considerably more attention is given to the fact that work involves a social as well as a technical environment (Button & Miller, 1972, pp. 108-109).

There may be some minor variations in the actual practice of situational assessment in individual facilities [for example, Miller (1968) suggests the use of any job station within a facility, not just contract jobs], but the basic elements of situational assessment are included in this statement.

4. It is very easy for some persons to focus upon just the job station and observational aspects of situational assessment. This makes situational assessment appear to be a very cheap and easy approach to vocational evaluation: Simply

*The material in this paper was abridged from Situational Assessment: Models for the Future, published by the Research and Training Center. Preparation of this paper was supported, in part, by Grant Number 16-P-56821/5, from the Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

place the client on any job station and watch what happens. In fact, this seems to be what passes for situational assessment in a number of rehabilitation facilities. Unfortunately, this ignores the critical element of situational assessment: the systematic variation of the elements of the work situation. As Button and Miller (1972) state, it is this systematic variation of elements that produces the "...concrete behavioral evidence of the problems clients have in adjusting to work settings...."

5. The elements of the work situation have to be identified before they can be systematically varied. This is probably the weakest aspect of the current practice of situational assessment. Many times, the elements of the work situation are known only to an individual vocational evaluator; if he leaves his job, this knowledge goes with him. In other instances, only a portion of the important elements in a work situation have been identified, making it difficult for the evaluator to correctly analyze and interpret the client's response to the situation. Methods need to be developed and used that will insure both that all of the important elements in the work situation have been identified, and that this information is recorded in a permanent and systematic manner. Additionally, this identification of elements should provide a set of observational cues to the evaluator, basically informing him of what he is to observe, while the client is in the particular work situation.

6. Any work situation can be analyzed in terms of two major components: the technology of the job and the social aspects of the work setting. Objective methods for identifying both the technical and social elements of work exist and await only application to workshop job stations by vocational evaluators interested in improving situational assessment. JOB ANALYSIS is concerned with the technology of the job station. This technique enables the evaluator to identify those worker functions and worker traits required for successful performance of the work tasks included in the job. BEHAVIOR SETTING ANALYSIS is concerned with the social aspects of the job station. This technique enables the evaluator to identify the typical patterns of behavior and social interaction which occur in the work setting. These two approaches are discussed in the following sections.

7. Recent modifications in job analysis techniques have led to an emphasis on describing the "job-worker situation" in functional terms (U.S. Department of Labor, 1970, 1972). To a great extent, these modifications have overcome a major deficiency of job analysis: a focus on the job rather than the worker (Neff, 1966). The first step in the Department of Labor job analysis procedure is to prepare a detailed description of all the tasks a worker must perform to complete the job. These task descriptions are written in a standardized format that states what the worker does, what he does it to, what he does it with, and the purpose for doing it. Once this step has been completed, these task descriptions are related to standardized descriptions of worker functions and worker traits. This provides the basis for the analysis of the job in worker related terms.

8. Worker functions refer to the significant relationships that a worker has to data, people, and things during successful performance of the job. Any job requires a worker to function in some relationship to data, people, or things and the hierarchies defined for each of these three relationships provide a convenient way of describing how the worker functions on a job. Worker traits refer to basic functional capacities of the worker. The traits used in the Department of Labor job analysis approach include general educational development, aptitudes, interests, temperaments, and physical capabilities. A "qualifications profile", indicating those traits a worker must possess to successfully perform the job, can be developed by comparing the

the task descriptions of the job to the standardized definitions for each level of the specific worker traits.

9. The use of job analysis techniques improves the evaluator's understanding of the technology of the job station being used in situational assessment. This directly relates to being able to say more about the performance of the client undergoing evaluation rather than simply indicating whether the client was successful or unsuccessful. The use of standardized terminology for worker functions and worker traits facilitates communication, as well as enabling the evaluator to link performance on the specific job or jobs used in situational assessment to probable client performance on other jobs, in the world of work requiring the same worker functions and worker traits. The improved knowledge of the technological requirements of the jobs, used for situational assessment, enables the evaluator to better identify specific functional problem areas the client may have. Additionally, the evaluator can improve his utilization of time by scheduling clients on work stations and his observational time in such a way as to avoid extensive duplication of observations and redundancy of performances.

10. The behavior setting analysis technique produces a description of the behaviors typical of a satisfactory worker in a specific work setting. It enables the evaluator to establish relationships between observed client behaviors and controlling factors that exist in the physical and social environment of the job station. The concept of a "behavior setting" is an extremely useful one in situational assessment. As defined by Shontz (1967), "behavior settings are naturally occurring units of the ...environment that include not only behavior but the social and physical contexts in which behavior occurs." More specifically, a behavior setting is a combination of behavior and a setting that has the following characteristics (Barker, 1968; LeCompte, n.d.):

1. a recurrent pattern of behavior.
2. a particular combination of physical and environmental characteristics.
3. a specific time and place.
4. a relationship between the behavior pattern and the characteristics of the setting.

A job station within a workshop generally meets the characteristics of a behavior setting. However, there are a number of other behavior settings within a workshop (e.g., cafeteria, lounge area, counseling office, etc.). A complete analysis of the behavior settings in a workshop would include these areas.

11. The behavior setting analysis details each of the characteristics of a behavior setting as they apply to a specific job station. The recurrent pattern of behavior is determined by observing the behaviors engaged in by a satisfactory worker on the job, and determining the percentage of time the worker engages in each behavior. Several methods can be used to obtain these time estimates (e.g., Button, et al, 1968; Peter, 1972). However, one simple method is to use one or more stop watches to record total elapsed time spent in each behavior during a series of observations randomly interspersed over the course of a working day.

12. Lustig (1970) has indicated that the physical and environmental characteristics of a work setting can be divided into five components: (1) the rules and customs

for the job; (2) the work task; (3) the social and interpersonal situation; (4) the physical environment; and (5) the worker himself. The analysis of the work task has been discussed in relation to job analysis. Additionally, since the purpose of vocational evaluation is to describe the client (or worker) in relation to other components of the work situation, the analysis of the physical and environmental characteristics of the work station focuses upon the rules and customs, social interactions, and physical environment of the job station.

13. The rules and customs of work are primarily established on a facility wide basis. Specific work stations, however, may have some unique rules and customs. Hair nets may be required on job stations involving moving machinery, but not on assembly or packaging job stations. It may be customary to allow workers in sales job stations to take rest breaks when customer flow permits, but to confine the rest breaks of workers on a production line to a specific time period when the entire line stops. Both the formal work rules and the accepted customs of the job station are observed and recorded in the analysis of the behavior setting.

14. The most complex area of analysis has to do with the social and interpersonal situation. There are so many possibilities that it is difficult to develop a complete taxonomy of possible interactions. Attention has to be given to those that occur with some frequency and regularity, with particular attention paid to the manner in which interactions are initiated, and the purpose for the interaction. Similarly, some attempt has to be made to identify some of the significant characteristics of persons the worker must interact with. This includes characteristics of co-workers as well as those of supervisors.

15. The physical environment surrounding the job "includes space, area, temperature, light, sound, equipment, machines, and tools (Lustig, 1970)." These factors are readily described, and some are included in the job analysis schedule for the work task. Particular attention is given to the position of the worker relative to other workers (Lustig, 1970). This includes workers ordinarily in proximity to the job station, as well as the location of the job station, in relation to traffic aisles.

16. When the behavior setting analysis is focused upon a job station, time and place are readily described by the working hours and departmental location of the job. Some jobs, however, may occur infrequently, while other behaviors of interest to the evaluator may occur only on a once per day basis in a particular location, (for example, coming to work on time). These need to be specified.

17. An essential quality of a behavior setting is that the behavior pattern is linked to the characteristics of the setting. For the most part, these links are apparent once both the behavior pattern and the characteristics of the environment are identified. There are occasions, however, where these links are subtle and involve interactions among several characteristics of the work setting. This requires very careful analysis, and a thorough understanding of the total work situation.

18. The application of job analysis and behavior setting analysis techniques to workshop job stations, used for situational assessment, is a basic step in making the job station into a "standardized situation." As Brandt (1972) uses the term, standardized situations "...occur and recur regularly enough to be ideal for measuring...behavior or performance under...relatively standardized conditions." The advantage of the standardized situation is that "...comparisons can be made among people merely by tallying and tabulating responses made in the same basic situation (Brandt, 1972)."

19. The standardized situation approach to situational assessment enables the vocational evaluator to make maximum use of available job stations. In particular, it enables the evaluator to introduce the systematic variations of job elements that are the crucial component of situational assessment in two ways. First, the evaluator can select specific job stations for use in evaluating a client on the basis that the job station contains an element of interest. This approach does not require the evaluator to manipulate the job station, rather he schedules himself to make observations of client performance or behavior when the crucial element occurs. Second, the evaluator can manipulate a particular job element in a work station to observe the effects on client performance or behavior. Since work station elements and their effects on behavior are identified, the evaluator is usually in a position to predict the probable effects of variation of an element.

20. Once the facility or workshop has developed a substantial number of its work stations into standardized situations for use in situational assessment, the performance and behavior of the client in evaluation can be more precisely identified across time and situations, using "recurrent pattern analysis (Brandt, 1972)." A series of observations of client performance and behavior, made in situations with known characteristics, are analyzed by examining the rate and frequency of occurrence of specific performances and behaviors in similar situations. The recurring pattern analysis technique is useful for separating behaviors into those that are characteristic of the individual, in any work situation, from those that are controlled by specific environmental factors, and those that represent unique responses of the individual to particular settings.

21. As the era of accountability and program evaluation progress, both vocational evaluators and facility administrators will have to provide adequate documentation of their efforts, and the results of their efforts. Situational assessment has been one of the grey areas of vocational evaluation. To establish and operate a situational assessment program, using available technology, requires considerable expenditures of time, effort, and money. The payoff of these expenditures is that the situational assessment approach to evaluation leads to more adequate accountability in terms of the accuracy and utility of information gained and conveyed to both the client and referring counselor. The basic question confronting administrators and evaluators at this time is whether they want to make the necessary investments in situational assessment.

DENNIS J. DUNN

1. The role of the evaluator has been described as that of the synthesizer of information from a variety of sources into an integrated concept -- this concept being -- "the client as worker". In relating this view of the evaluator to vocational evaluation as a whole within the framework of this VEWA project, it quickly becomes obvious that the evaluator himself, in terms of his knowledge and skills, training and individual capacities and responsibilities, is central. How he functions as a person; how he relates to the sources of information, be they peer, professionals, tests, employers, reports or whatever; and how he deals with this information is important. Is the evaluator a generalist dealing with all information, or a specialist contributing specific information? Hence, although this topic falls under "The Evaluator's Tools", since in a sense the evaluator himself is a tool, it also relates directly to "The Evaluator".

2. Beyond this, sources of information about a client's vocational functioning, and the information to be synthesized by the evaluator, can be considered "tools" and are points of emphasis. Most of the sources of information are human interpreters of the client's functioning or his physical state, and the evaluator's effectiveness depends not only on his understanding of their work, but also on his relationship with these people. Hence "human dynamics" in vocational evaluation is an integral part of this topic. Since the client himself is the ultimate source of all information, and it is assumed that the evaluator will continually check this information with the needs of the client, this topic is also closely related to "Client Participation in Evaluation." Hopefully, the client functions as a partner or co-synthesizer in the synthesizing process.

3. Literature Review. In reviewing the literature concerning the role of evaluator as synthesizer, one is quickly struck by its similarity to the literature of a decade or so ago, and continuing to the present, regarding the definition of the role of the rehabilitation counselor. The question common to both is: Is the counselor/evaluator a generalist with working knowledge of all professions relating to man as worker, or is he a specialist with specific skills and responsibilities functioning on a team of specialists? For example, "he learns to recognize the basic principles involved in medicine and psychiatry, psychology, sociology, social work, law, education, and other fields... (and) he is able to draw from these fields whatever information is available and interpret this information in terms of vocational objectives" (Johnston, 1960). This was one view of the Rehabilitation Counselor, circa 1960; it would seem to apply directly to the view of the evaluator as generalist/synthesizer. Thus, the outcome of the long-term coordinator versus counselor controversy within the field of rehabilitation counseling, may have some parallels in the generalistic versus specialists question with the field of evaluation. At present, there appear to be both specialist counselors and generalistic coordinators of services.

4. Hoffman (1969) observes "with vocational evaluation involving the evaluation for medical, psychological, vocational, educational, cultural, social factors, and environmental factors a variety of professional persons are involved". He discusses the value of a staff who come from a variety of sources, e.g., occupational therapist, foremen in industry, psychologists, rehabilitation counselors, and industrial arts, and suggests that vocational evaluation be conducted in one comprehensive facility under the team approach, or through referral to separate professionals or facilities. He also suggests that one individual, "such as a rehabilitation counselor" be a "coordinator" of the whole process. Dautermann (1964) is representative of the view of the evaluator as "one more specialist" whose functions are to assist the client to evaluate himself, and to provide rehabilitation workers with information about

the client's performance. Lustig is quoted (Hoffman, 1969) as distinguishing between the "work evaluator", who functions as a work evaluation specialist, and the "vocational evaluator", who is a sort of vocational Renaissance man competent in all vocationally related areas and, therefore, non-existent.

5. Many sources of information pertinent to the evaluation of a client's vocational functioning and potential, and hence pertinent to "the evaluator as synthesizer", are found in the literature. Not unexpectedly, many of the articles pointing out the importance of a specific source of information, e.g., medical, are written by workers in that area, e.g., physician, occupational therapist. For example, a study indicating that the specific vocational objectives of 47% of a sample 110 clients, were directly influenced by a medical opinion, was written by medical professionals (Gorthy, et al, 1959). The holistic viewpoint in evaluation is pervasive through the literature. For example "...we cannot isolate vocation as work from the rest of living... One works only during certain portions of one's living time. The rest of the time one is doing all sorts of things which have profound bearing on how effectively one works" (Cobb, 1967). Among the vocationally relevant sources of information mentioned in the literature, McAlees' (1967) summary is representative: 1) work history, 2) educational and social data, 3) client and family interviews, 4) medical and psychiatric consultation, 5) psychological testing, 6) work samples, 7) workshop evaluation, 8) part-time or temporary work, 9) behavior observational methods, e.g., role playing job interviews, 10) on-the-job training experience, and 11) case conference. If indeed the information from these varied sources are the raw material upon which the worker/synthesizer operates, the worker who synthesizes this data must be both knowledgeable and capable of a high level of abstract thought and concept formation.

6. Sources of information relevant to the evaluator can be divided into those that are directly under his control and immediate experience, and those which are not. Thus far, we have discussed synthesizing information from a variety of disciplines, and thus, the synthesizer as a generalist. However, the literature also deals with the synthesis of information gathered by the evaluator with the tools at his disposal, and hence with the role of the evaluator as a specialist. The evaluator as synthesizer determines what types of behavior are relevant with what types of clients, and how to weight these data in terms of their relative importance in describing "the client as worker", and predicting his vocational potential. He selects pertinent data from behavioral observations of work habits and supervisory relationships; work sample and testing scores and behaviors; work readiness factors such as attendance and punctuality; hygiene, etc. Cobb (1967) in writing about the mentally retarded suggests five major areas to be synthesized: 1) personal factors, self-concept, etc.; 2) self-management -- of the everyday affairs of life; 3) interpersonal relationships -- close human relationships; 4) interpersonal-social transactions -- social role to role, as employee to boss; and 5) productive behavior -- job skills of all kinds. The weighing of information as its relative importance is individual with each specific client. Attempts have been made to gather information and develop predictive scores from several disciplines, and to combine these scores into a composite score, which would be used for predicting vocational success, e.g., Yue and Moed (1960). But for many reasons, including the large number of unknowns and situational variables, and unrefined techniques, evaluations based specifically on statistical results have had little emphasis. As evaluation tools and sources of information become more refined, the vast literature of statistical versus clinical prediction will become more relevant. Unless, as Dunn (1969) suggests, evaluation is essentially a process of "understanding" rather than "predicting".

7. Personal Observations. From this writer's point of view, a team approach to evaluation is most effective, so long as there is close communication between team members, and as long as one team member is responsible for the coordination of activities and

synthesizing specific recommendations. The variety of input regarding a client, from rehabilitation workers of different but work-relevant backgrounds and training, is valuable. Basic to the whole process, however, is the client's role and responsibility in his own evaluation; his experience, learning and internalization -- his synthesis -- of the results, is the most meaningful aspect of evaluation for his overall rehabilitation and life adjustment. The role of synthesizer of information thus falls upon the worker, who is most conversant with the variety of information sources, but most importantly, who best understands the client. This depends on the agency, and can be the counselor, the work evaluator, the psychologist, or whomever. No one field thus far has been given synthesizing responsibilities, and, perhaps this point in the development of rehabilitation worker roles and responsibilities, this is fortunate.

8. The training, knowledge, and skills of the evaluator undoubtedly influence his assigned responsibilities in the evaluation process in a specific setting. Usually the generalist as the synthesizer of information is academically trained, often with graduate experience. His training may have included a familiarization with other professions, assessment methods, human behavior, etc., and he is thus probably familiar with most information sources. He has been judged on thought and concept formation, and has been required to write papers and integrate information from broad sources. But in some settings this training and background may not be the most appropriate for the role of work evaluator, or to fill out the needs and gaps in a specific evaluation team. The mature work evaluator, for example, with broad work experience in a variety of job settings, but with little or no academic preparation beyond high school level, has a great deal of realistic job information and may be most appropriate for the team. In this writer's experience, a number of evaluators falling into this category function well as evaluators, especially in a specialist role, with the assigned responsibility of contributing information on "the client as worker" to the team. Another team member, such as the evaluation counselor, may then function as generalist and overall synthesizer of technical information from other professions and sources. On a team, a balance of academic with broad vocational backgrounds can be useful, since both backgrounds provide experiences and insight, which can be highly valuable to a client's understanding of himself as potential worker.

9. The concept of "synthesizing" entails the gathering together of pertinent information into an integrated concept -- a whole -- in this case "the client as worker". The evaluator must be careful that it does not also imply a static concept, a concrete description; evaluation is a process which requires constant or a least periodic feedback, and the evaluator must be ready to resynthesize, to update his concept of the client, to be ready and flexible enough to take in and accept new information as it is found, or as the client changes. The danger of stereotyping clients, or categorizing them based on similarities to other previous clients, is also a problem of the synthesizer, whether he is functioning as a generalist or specialist. The dangers of static concepts and stereotyping can be met by giving the client responsibility in the evaluation for synthesizing and internalizing information about himself. Another area of concern involves the human dynamics in the evaluator's relationships with other rehabilitation workers. If his background and training are significantly different from the other workers, he may experience problems in communicating his view of the client. This may be especially so if the work evaluator is interpreting observed behavior in terms of the reality of the work supervisor, while his co-workers consider themselves working with underlying motivation to that behavior. In any case, the evaluator's skills at working with people are critical, both in gathering and interpreting data, from and to clients, and peer professionals.

10. Information from a variety of sources must be considered in the evaluation of a client. While the evaluator may, in many cases, function as a specialist, he must be cognizant of how to use information from other disciplines in understanding his client. He

must also have a clear understanding of the role of a worker in a variety of job settings, so that he can determine not only what information is pertinent, but also for what jobs certain types of information are more important than others. For example, for the jobs of assembly-line workers, salesmen, or draftsman different types of information, e.g., social skills and dexterity, are pertinent, and are weighted differently as to their importance in the performance of the job. Thus, the evaluator as synthesizer, especially if he is functioning as a generalist, must be conversant with information from the variety of sources (noted in McAlees summary in paragraph 5 above). It may be that it is more important to the team that the work evaluator be familiar with the characteristics and demands of jobs than that he be highly knowledgeable of the specific information and data developed by other professions and sources.

11. Information from other professions, conveyed in reports, tends to be treated more concretely, and is less susceptible to updating, than information presented by another team member. Medical reports describing disability; social histories defining peer and family relationships; psychological testing reports; and educational transcripts are "givens" which set the limits for planning. Information from team members, including the above professions, which is conveyed via discussion and interpretation, rather than in reports, can become more viable as it is updated with the client's progress. Information concerning the client's behavior and motivations receives much attention because of its changing, non-static nature. With many clients, specific "vocational" data are not emphasized until sometime after they have entered the evaluation program, because of the emotional and behavioral problems concomitant with adjusting to the new setting. The program this writer is associated with is a residential facility and behavior in the residence during non-work hours receives major emphasis in staffing and vocational planning. Hence, while the information from other professions and disciplines provides the background for a client, and both sets the limits and engenders hypotheses about the client's potential, the client's behavioral functioning at the evaluation facility provides the information which may be most salient to his vocational planning. Indeed, some evaluation workers initially do not read reports describing the client as he was before he entered the evaluation program, because they believe that it gives them preconception about the client, and interferes with their getting to know him "as he actually is".

12. Theory as it Relates to Practice. The theoretical underpinnings of the evaluator as synthesizer are scarce in the literature. Areas relevant to theoretical treatment would include the responsibilities and role of the evaluator in relation to other members of the rehabilitation team; the evaluator as generalist versus specialist; background and training of evaluators; clinical versus statistical (or subjective versus objective) synthesis and prediction; and participation of client as co-synthesizer. Perhaps the most crucial need is to define the role of evaluation and the evaluator in terms of their place within a theoretical model of rehabilitation. In theory, rehabilitation and evaluation are "coterminous processes" with evaluation continuing even after job placement and until the client is functioning at his highest level on an appropriate job (Gellman, 1968). Thus, while the process of evaluation is continuous by the client, different rehabilitation workers may be responsible for the updating and resynthesizing during different phases of the rehabilitation program. If one rehabilitation worker works with the client throughout the process, this worker then might best play the role of generalist synthesizer. The work evaluator's role is usually more circumscribed and functions during the initial phases of the rehabilitation process. He helps formulate the initial decisions and predictions, but both practice and research indicate that predictions in rehabilitation are most valid for the next step in the rehabilitation plan, and become decreasingly valid as the client progresses through his rehabilitation program.

13. The theoretical view of man as a holistic being, who cannot be partitioned without losing his essence, demands he be viewed from all directions and dimensions to be understood. No one worker has all the knowledge and skills to provide all rehabilitation services. Theoretically, a team of specialists, whose training and background supplement each other, which includes the client, and with one worker being responsible to coordinate and synthesize the process, would be both necessary and ideal. In practice, the human dynamics involved in team functioning can become extremely complex and communication lines can tangle hopelessly. Diversity of background and training can lead to confrontations of philosophy and approach rather than an enriched awareness of the client. The synthesizer may thus be working with inadequate or incomplete information. Hence, a team must deal openly with any problems in communications and work together, in order for it and synthesizer to work effectively. The synthesizer must be closely attuned to and aware of the client, as well as information about him, in order to adequately synthesize a concept of the "client as worker".

14. Within a theoretical model of rehabilitation, training for the evaluation sector should supplement but not duplicate training for other sectors, although enough overlap should exist to promote communication between workers. Training programs are probably not broad enough at this time to train the generalist adequately (Hoffman, 1969). As the profession and the tools for evaluation develop and refine, and as the evaluator becomes responsible for assessment in greater depth and finer precision and validity, his role may well become more and more that of specialist. The use of computer data and statistical analysis, which at this time are mainly of research and theoretical interest in the field, may become considerably more relevant as methods of measurement and quantification are found for many of the variables thus far not accessible to measurement. While it is theorized that evaluation is an ongoing process with continual feedback and change, in practice workers are not always open to revising their conceptions of clients. Clients are sometimes quickly categorized and considerable change on their part is required before a worker resynthesizes his concept of that client. In general, theory may posit the goal or the ideal toward which the field is striving, but has not yet reached. The theoretical aspects of this topic are still being formulated

15. Questions to be Answered. The questions that need to be dealt with to define the topic of the evaluator as synthesizer focus on the evaluator himself, his background and training, information he deals with, and the goals and effectiveness of the synthesized concepts of the "client as worker". A major question is, Who is the synthesizer? Who has the responsibility for synthesizing information in evaluation and rehabilitation? Should this responsibility be defined and limited to one discipline? For example, should the synthesizer be the worker who subjectively best understands the client, or an objective observer of his behavior?

16. A recurring theme in this paper revolves around the roles of generalist or specialist in the synthesizing process. The questions to be asked are: Is the synthesizer's role that of the generalist? Is the evaluator's role that of the generalist or the specialist? The generalist synthesizes information from a variety of sources and disciplines, while the specialist synthesizes information gathered primarily from his own tools and observations. Where is the evaluator on the continuum between specialist and generalist? At either extreme? Near the middle? How well does the evaluator understand medical, psychological and social data? A question related to this is: How does the evaluator's background and training influence his potential role as synthesizer of information? The questions regarding what type of background is most appropriate for the evaluator, and what knowledge and skills does the synthesizer need, are germane.

17. Central to this topic and in need of more attention is the question: What sources and types of information are most relevant and useful for vocational evaluation? Does the evaluator or evaluation team concern itself primarily with specific job information? Does it broaden its focus to include kindred professions? Does it expand further to include family and community living data for synthesis? Can't a generalization be made as to which data sources are most relevant, or is this individual to each client? A similar and related question involves the theoretical view of rehabilitation as a holistic process involving the whole person. Does vocational evaluation also need to be a holistic process or can work-related variables be isolated with little need to synthesize non-job variables?

18. Directly relevant to the above problems are these final questions. First, What are the goals and purposes for which evaluation data are summarized? More specifically, Is the goal of the synthesis of information in evaluation essentially a process of understanding or predicting? Synthesizing information for the purpose of understanding a client -- and helping him understand himself -- and developing treatment plans to facilitate his growth -- may well be somewhat different from evaluating a client primarily for the purpose of predicting his potential for various training programs or jobs. Finally, including the client in his evaluation is generally considered a positive practice. In this writer's opinion, the major lasting gains and insights derived from the evaluation experience are those made by the client. He should be given as much responsibility in the evaluation process as he can handle. Realizing that this may vary with each client, the questions are: To what degree should the client participate as co-synthesizer in his evaluation? How may client participation and responsibility be facilitated?

19. Challenge. By this time the challenge to the forum should be clear, even if the topic is not. The evaluator's role and his tools are still in the process of evolving, and need definition, so that future efforts at evaluator training and development may be planned and guided rather than sporadic and haphazard. Wasteful duplication of efforts with other disciplines can be avoided, while the gaps in evaluation services can be identified and dealt with. When evaluators have a clearer understanding of their responsibilities in the synthesizing of information, and of the value of various types of information, more effective functioning can be expected. And, if evaluators do not clarify this area, someone else will undoubtedly structure their responsibility for them.

20. What in essence has been discussed in this paper is the extremely delicate responsibility involved when one man attempts to understand and make decisions with/for another, and especially since this understanding may critically influence life adjustment. It has been suggested that the client has not only the right but the responsibility to participate in his own evaluation. The imperative for the worker is that he develop his skills and his sensitivities to his client's interest, so that both the man and his society benefit. Intrinsic to the topic is man's relationship to man, without a humanistic framework. The challenge thus becomes to define this topic creatively, and with sensitivity, to the needs of the people served.

JACK GENSKOW

1. If there is a commonality among clients seen in vocational evaluation, regardless of the evaluation setting, the disability of the clients or the geographical region in which they live, it is that of repeated personal failures. It is my contention that any given series of personal or environmental failures can affect a client's self-concept to a point where he questions whether he is personally equipped to meet the complexities of the society in which he finds himself existing. John Holt, in his book, How Children Fail, suggests that most children in school fail. For a great many, this failure is avowed and absolute. He states that close to 40% of those children that begin high school drop out before they finish; college dropouts average one out of three. Many others fail in fact, if not in name. They complete their schooling because we have agreed to push them up through the grades and out of the schools, whether they know anything or not. There are many more of these children than we dare to think. He also goes on to say that except for a handful of children who may or may not be good students, each failed to develop more than a tiny part of their tremendous capacity for learning, understanding, and creating. If we consider Holt's thoughts, we can well understand why the common trend of failure runs consistently through those clients seen in a vocational evaluation program. The pattern of failure is engraved early in the lives of many of the clients seen in vocational evaluation, one failing experience built upon another, until it is difficult for them to summon the mental and physical energies necessary to bring about a success. Vocational counselors often refer to clients as being non-motivated, because they have failed to meet some responsibility set for them by the counselor in the rehabilitation process. I submit that many of these clients are, in actuality, motivated, but do not have the personal self-concept needed to meet these externally set responsibilities.

2. The vocational evaluation process, in my opinion, can often provide the client with insights into his personal considerations and abilities, thus allowing him an opportunity to call upon the internal energies necessary to meet external responsibilities. For the evaluation experience to be a meaningful, relevant, and profitable experience for a client, it must be looked at in a more comprehensive framework than that of just putting a client through an "evaluation system" that will provide the vocational counselor with information about the client's ability to be employed or trained in a particular area. Too often, vocational evaluation programs are established in rehabilitation centers by naive administrators, who feel that clients can be evaluated by existing evaluation systems, regardless of the ability of the vocational evaluators; and that this information will equip the vocational counselor with all the necessary data he needs to place his client in an appropriate job or training slot. There is a basic error of judgment in this proposition. If the vocational evaluation unit is not manned by vocational evaluators, who are excellent clinicians with an ability and an established philosophy for working with people, then no existing evaluation system is capable of providing the necessary data for the vocational counselor. If we accept the proposition that the vocational evaluation process forms the foundational information for a vocational counselor to move his client through the rehabilitation process, then we must also accept the proposition that a client must experience success in the evaluation process. The equipping of a client with insight into his own strengths and weaknesses, through the use of a variety of experiential tools, including work samples, psychological tests, situational assessments, on-sight assessments, etc., then becomes the essence of the evaluators unique contribution to the rehabilitation process. The evaluator must stand steadfast -- one foot planted firmly in the realities of an ever changing competitive labor market, with the other placed in the therapies that will ultimately bring his client to a point where he can, with a relative degree of assuredness, re-enter that labor market and expect to be successful. As simply stated as possible, the vocational evaluation process should have as its main goal the reduction of client failure. The establishment of a vocational evaluation setting that embodies

a philosophy, and the manpower capability of meeting this goal is an extremely difficult task.

3. There have been many articles written both in the area of rehabilitation and in allied fields on the client self-concept. Few of them have established, however, any direct course of action of how to set up a program that would facilitate building or rebuilding of a client self-concept. Rehabilitation has traditionally relied upon the remedial programs, including sheltered workshops, to meet this need. However, it is clear, from the writings at this point in time, that we have not begun to understand the complexity of re-establishing or redirecting clients' self-concept or internal motivation. I submit that a well-planned evaluation unit in many cases can start the client along the road to meeting this objective.

4. It is critical to the development of such a unit that the evaluative process have an underlying, philosophical foundation that will facilitate insight to his own strengths and weaknesses. There are many in the field at this time who would argue that the evaluator should be an objective, non-involved observer in the evaluation process; however, I submit that a well defined program, with a properly educated evaluator, who has clear insight into the philosophy of the evaluation unit, has little difficulty in meeting several roles other than a merely passive observer of the client behavior, or a technician who records percentiles from a particular test. The evaluator, in most instances, must move in and out of a variety of roles during the evaluation process so that his client can meet his personal objectives and gain insight into his unique strengths and weaknesses. The evaluation process is not an end in itself; it is the first step back to self awareness and personal insight for the client. Without this first step, the establishment of a solid foundation for all the other endeavors in the rehabilitation process, his frustrations will surely be increased, and the chances for ultimate success will be greatly diminished. I submit to the readers of this paper that underlying the principles of vocational evaluation, and the establishment of a vocational evaluation unit, regardless of the physical setting, should be many of the concepts embraced in the area of Gestalt psychology. Let us, for a moment, look at the two concepts for the purpose of identifying those similarities that would be useful in developing an operational philosophy that would facilitate the rebuilding of an individual's self-concept.

GESTALTIST CONCEPTS

5. Although Gestalt psychology is largely a theory of perception, some attempt has been made to apply the principles to psychotherapy. The objectives of treatment or working with people according to Pearls, Hefferline, and Goodman is to overcome the fragmentations of feelings, thinking, and acting which are so characteristic of our culture, and replace it with a holistic unitary outlook on life. This can be done, they claim, by encouraging a more flexible relationship between the individual and his environment, or in Gestalt terms between figure and foreground. It is also clear that Gestalt therapy is a basically humanistic, existential therapy. The general approach requires that the therapist direct the client's awareness, so that the client experiences himself as he is, not as he would like to be, or who he thinks he should be, but how he is. Through this awareness, he experiences how he expresses his feelings, how he blocks those feelings and, often, how he defeats himself. Once he has awareness of this behavior, the individual can begin experimenting with himself and changes begin to occur. The goal of the Gestaltist is integration of self. This goal is accomplished by supporting the individual's genuine interests, needs and desires.

VOCATIONAL EVALUATION

6. Vocational evaluation is the process of assessing and predicting work behavior and work potential through the application of reality-based assessment techniques and procedures. Although potential employment is of concern to the vocational evaluator and

his client, the goal of evaluation is more than that of a job. Also of importance, is the awareness of an individual's strengths and weaknesses, the manner in which they are manifested, and their effect on the individual's life. Although the terminology differs, I believe, that there are many overlapping viewpoints in philosophy of the Gestaltist and the Vocational Evaluator. Both approaches are existential in nature. Nadolsky (1971) states that Vocational Evaluation is concerned with the individual in relationship to his environment. Simkins emphasizes that the Gestalt therapy is concerned with interaction in the present ongoing situations. Both approaches have a goal--an individual who is self-supporting (doing things for himself which he is capable of doing) and self-fulfilling. In order to more fully understand the similarities of the two approaches, I have outlined the approaches of each for your examination.

THERAPEUTIC PROCESS OF GESTALT THERAPY	PROCESS OF VOCATIONAL EVALUATION
a. The therapist is an observer of the here and now behavior of the individual (posture, voice, gestures, etc.) b. The therapist assists the individual in maintaining his awareness of himself. c. The therapist is the director of awareness experiments (in trying on new behavior, making feelings explicit). d. The therapist provides frustration and support in balanced amounts whenever appropriate. e. The therapist is concerned that the individual become active and responsible for his behavior. Responsibility (response-ability, ability to respond) for oneself cannot be forced. Responsibility is not a choice, but a fact of life which a person may or may not accept. f. The goal of therapy is to help a mature person move from environmental support to self-support. He may be described in Maslow's terms as a self-actualizing individual.	a. The evaluator is an observer of the client's capabilities, aptitudes, attitudes, and interests. He may use personal observations, psychometric tests, work samples, situational assessments, as well as other tools, to gain this information. b. The evaluator shares his knowledge with the client as it pertains to the client's strengths and weaknesses, the way in which they are manifested, and their possible vocational implications. c. The evaluator may present the client with unfamiliar tasks or human interactional situations in order to observe the client's manner of reacting and coping, as well as giving the client an opportunity to try out new situations or activities. d. The evaluator may provide frustration and support in a balanced manner whenever appropriate. e. Once a client is aware of his alternatives, he alone makes a choice as to what he wishes to pursue vocationally or in any other area. The client exercises choice and has the ultimate responsibility for the consequences of his action. f. The goal of vocational evaluation (the rehabilitation process) is a self-supporting individual, who is aware of his strengths and weaknesses, and, who seeks to enhance his life through productive work or meaningful activities.

7. Thus, the process of vocational evaluation and Gestalt therapy are similar. Both the evaluator and the therapist are directive and active, as opposed to non-directive and passive, in working with their clients. Both disciplines rely heavily on setting up experimental situations that will allow the client to explore his strengths and weaknesses, so that he may gain greater insight into how he can best function in our society. Both concepts also involve a model choice, and each has as its goal a responsible, self-supporting, self-fulfilling individual. In addition to these viewpoints, there are several other concepts in Gestalt therapy and psychology that may be helpful to the vocational evaluator, in helping his client to rebuild a new self-concept. These concepts will be presented briefly for your examination.

SELF-AWARENESS

8. The degree to which one is willing to be in touch with his own inner experiences (feelings) is the degree to which one is open to experiencing the other person. In interaction with other individuals, the best clue to understanding him, and how he is feeling, is to be aware of how I am reacting to him. The importance of this concept to the vocational evaluator is obvious. An evaluator has many tools of evaluation at his disposal -- work samples, psychological tests, performance tests, interest tests, aptitudes, on-site evaluation, and situational assessment. However, his most potent evaluation tool is himself; his reactions, observations, and feelings about the client are of prime importance. This subjective data is invaluable in assessing a client's overall work and life potential. The acquisition of this subjective data requires first that the evaluator be an excellent clinician who works with his client, and second that the evaluator realize that he is a unique individual interacting with another unique individual, the client. It is difficult for an evaluator to be aware of his reactions, observations, and feelings, if he responds to a client from the role of a technician who merely administers tests. In order for an evaluator to fulfill his responsibility to the client, to the referring agency, and to himself, he must go beyond objective data and experience the client as a person. At our present stage of testing development of most of the tools used by the vocational evaluator in evaluation settings, it is, or should be, very clear that they lack the sophistication necessary to make decisions solely upon percentile rankings. A well-trained clinician, using the present tools available, can do an admirable job of providing valuable information to the referring counselor; however, given a poorly trained technician, the counselor receives nothing more than inadequately normed, psychological, and work sample testing data that does not take into consideration the uniqueness of his client.

9. Another concept that has applicability to the evaluator is that of THREE A's.
- a. AWARENESS of what I do and how I do it. Awareness is the direct experience or contact with reality.
 - b. ACCEPTANCE of what and how I am.
 - c. ALLOWING myself to be the way I am.

Without all three -- AWARENESS, ACCEPTANCE, AND ALLOWING -- either in the evaluator or the client -- growing is greatly hindered. The ramifications of the THREE A's are numerous. So often a disabled individual is painfully aware of his disability, but often he is not aware of how he uses his disability to meet his needs. In addition, a disabled individual often has difficulty accepting himself as he is and allowing himself to be that way without recriminations, feelings of inferiority, or self-pity. An evaluator can often provide experiences for the client which will help engender feelings of self-acceptance in the client. Frequently, during the evaluation process, the client becomes aware of many skills and unique talents which he possesses, despite his handicap. He may also learn of areas of potential which he may explore further and possibly develop. The client's self-acceptance may also be developed through the evaluator's acceptance of the client--his right to a good job and a meaningful life.

10. After self-acceptance comes ALLOWING. Allowing does not mean complacency or stagnation. It means a recognition of strengths and weaknesses, a knowledge of personal limits, and a realistic appraisal of what the client is capable of doing. Allowing means no fruitless baying at the moon ("for how I used to be" or "how I could, or should, have been"). It means striving to use my strengths and weaknesses, in the most powerful combination, in order to enhance my life. Generally, the degree to which I am willing to be aware, accepting and allowing of myself, is the degree to which I am willing to be aware, accepting and allowing of others. Thus, in order to understand, empathize with, and evaluate others, I must have respect for myself and the goals of my profession. This is also extraordinarily true for the client. If he is to have a meaningful, fulfilling life, he must have respect for himself and understand how he fits, with his unique qualities, in a very complex and sometimes overwhelming society. The evaluation process can contribute to the development of this insight, and can offer the client an opportunity to take that first step back to rebuilding his self-concept--successful rehabilitation--ability to take his rightful place in society.

11. A final illustration that I will use for this paper is that of learning. Perls defines learning--"to discover that something is possible." This definition for me is the essence of the entire evaluation process. The task of the evaluator is to use his clinical skills, creativity, imagination, and the tools of his profession to aid the client in discovering what is possible for him. Given the foundation of a good vocational evaluation, and the assistance of all other components within the rehabilitation process, especially that of the relationship between the counselor and the client, I feel that the basic underlying viewpoints of both the Gestaltist and the vocational evaluator can bring the client from a point of societal dependency to his ultimate and self-directed independence. The problem is simple. If the client's self-concept is that of dependency, then he must first embrace and develop the internal self-confidence to see himself as an independent individual who has something to offer himself, as well as the society in which he lives. If the client is thrust through the rehabilitation process into either competitive placement, vocational training, or additional education without rebuilding that all-important self-concept, then we in rehabilitation have done nothing except contribute to another experiential failure.

12. It has been my personal experience as a floor evaluator that those clients who, through the process of vocational evaluation, gain genuine insight into their strengths and weaknesses are better equipped, due to the evaluation process, to succeed in the rehabilitation process. One of the operational goals of those evaluators who worked under my supervision was that if the referring counselor or the referring agency from which the client came were to drop out of existence the day following the client's completion of evaluation, then the client should have gained some additional insights into his own strengths and weaknesses that would give him a better chance to compete in a complex society. Knowing this to be an unrealistic goal for all clients, I still maintain that if it becomes the true goal of the vocational evaluation unit many clients can take that initial step back to personal independence.

13. It has been my concern for a number of years as a practicing vocational evaluator that evaluators often rely on their evaluation tools without taking into consideration the inadequacies of those tools. Even as the field develops today, both in the private and the non-private sectors, this basic problem is not being resolved. Therefore, the ability of the clinician, the vocational evaluator with clinical skills, becomes even more important to the success of the rehabilitation process. The vocational counselor and the evaluator, working as colleagues for the purpose of bringing a client from a point of societal and personal dependency to that of independence, becomes a team that is unequalled in any other human service delivery system.

CHALLENGE TO FORUMS

14. I grant that our knowledge in Vocational Evaluation is limited and that our concept of man must be rounded out with borrowed or improvised propositions. But surely we must continually incorporate such knowledge as we have with that of other fields. Let us make no mistake about it: our job is to throw light on the nature of man. As practical and realistic men, we must commit ourselves completely to those views about man that we think are most worth the gamble. As Vocational Evaluators, we owe it to ourselves, and to others, to say what particular assumptions we are prepared to act upon, in order to clarify our own thinking, to give more consistent direction to our profession and, with respect to clients, to let them know what they are going to get for the time and energy they spend.

QUESTIONS

15. It is my opinion, that the field of Vocational Evaluation has made significant strides, especially in the last few years, toward developing methodologies that demonstrate its usefulness in the rehabilitation process. Based on this statement, I question whether the practitioners in the field (forum members) are willing to address themselves to the future of our field, or whether they will be content to rest upon those techniques currently being used without adventuring into the unknown.

16. The question frequently put forth asking that evaluators define their role in the rehabilitation process is an antiquated one at this point in the field's development. I am asking the forum to address itself to the question of the evaluator/counselor relationship, as it relates to the clients they serve. (Are they colleagues offering their particular skills in the rehabilitation of a client or are they in competition, each trying to secure professional territorial boundaries?)

THOMAS L. BRANDON

1. The quality of the interpersonal dynamics between the evaluator and the client will be a critical parameter in our efforts to further professionalize the role of the vocational evaluator. If the evaluator is to achieve self-acceptance as a professional rather than a technician, he must develop competencies in the applied science of clinical observation, and longitudinal evaluation of the work-related behavior of his client. He must begin to function as a key facilitator who not only identifies specific vocational potential, but also opens up options which will further develop his client's functional ability. He must become a specialist in evaluating man in his work environment, with major concern for the constellation of responses needed to develop a healthy work personality.
2. The evaluator must have concern and a continuing role in the entire rehabilitation process. Job placement and retention feedback must be used to determine the effectiveness of his interaction with the client. He should have the ability to control the institutional decisions and structures, so that they are responsive to his clinical observations as to when and how the evaluation process begins and is responsively modified. Our discussion of these issues should result in a changed perception of the entire field of vocational evaluation, and a concern for a different kind of technology--a technology concerned with involving the client in a growth promoting way, with the realities of specific environments. We must accept the responsibility of working with the client to achieve a mutuality of goal and seek an ongoing, reciprocal interaction that is both verbal and nonverbal, based on human dynamics, and not on institutional or technological imperatives.
3. The evaluator himself has written very little on his interpersonal relationship with his client. Most of the literature in the field relates to counselor-client interaction and ignores the impact of the evaluator's personality as a means of enhancing client motivation and self-regard. Lustig has developed, and his students have applied, a method of differentially structuring critical stimulus determinants in the total work environment for each client. Although concerned primarily with work adjustment training, this clinical treatment is equally valuable in initial vocational evaluation. Dunn has also described a developmental model which assumes that the faulty behaviors and performances identified by the vocational evaluator can be modified or eliminated by the application of specific treatments. He emphasizes that work evaluators must assume a developmental posture and show an awareness of the work implications of a wider range of human behavior and behavioral change models than is the case when the prediction of a vocational area is the sole objective.
4. The Chicago JVS Research Utilization Laboratory has developed a guide and manual on client observation and client evaluation in workshops which have been demonstrated to be very valuable in increasing the sensitivity of the evaluator as a client-interactor. Pruitt, in his survey comparing graduates of Master's level training in evaluation with other evaluators, has recommended greater emphasis on competency skills as opposed to course content. Overs has studied the effect of higher anxiety on the ability of the client to participate fully in the evaluation process. He suggests that evaluators be more skillful in helping their clients cope with the stress raised by the evaluation situation.
5. Many other writers have stressed the importance of accepting the client as an equal interactor in the evaluation process. Olshansky has described a greater role for the client as a decision maker. The participants in the University of Pittsburgh Conference in 1970 on Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Services in Manpower, Social Welfare, and Rehabilitation Programs concluded that elaborate efforts to develop an effective systems methodology would not reduce the need for more skilled and more

professional clinical approaches to client participation in the evaluation process. Brolin's article on the special challenge of evaluating the mentally retarded is a good example of professional attention to the differential approaches necessary with each of the major disability groupings. Rusalem and Baxt, analyzing the delivery system in rehabilitation, observed that most published materials concern themselves with environmental, rather than attitudinal, variables, reflecting a generalized preoccupation with systems, rather than with deliverers and recipients. Ayers has written on means of making vocational evaluation more relevant to the disadvantaged clients. Lawlis has developed a methodology of rating the interpersonal skills of the rehabilitation professional. His concern is with empathy, warmth, and genuineness; his ratings are based upon evaluation of client responses and perceptions, rather than therapist self-evaluations. In summary, the published material in the field is adequate only as a stimulus for much more writing and discussion by evaluators themselves.

6. My own experience as a practitioner in vocational evaluation has stimulated me to think in terms of reciprocating interactions between the evaluator and the client in a group relationship best characterized as socio-productive. Because the work environment creates opportunity for closing the social distance that separates the professional helpers from the helped, I would like to suggest discussion of some roles that the client might delineate in this situation: I am sure he would stress his need for competency, predictability, and openness in your responses to him. I am equally convinced that he would like to have some control of the distance, the content, and the intensity of the relationship.

7. If we view the evaluation as social learning, rather than isolated learning, we should be able to establish a more meaningful intermediate, as well as long-range goals with the client. If we focus on vocationally, realistic behavior that is achievable with reasonable effort and use success to increase motivation, we can then use increased motivation to raise both levels of performance and goals.

8. I hope we will also explore the implications of many clients not being able to meaningfully interact with the evaluator because they place the locus of control outside of themselves. I would suggest that we accept some responsibility for identifying this behavioral trait, and seize the opportunity to break the pattern. When a client feels he has no control over what happens to him, evaluation is at best a one-sided process.

9. A major observation has been that the evaluator is not as preoccupied with technology as the structure of vocational evaluation systems would indicate. He is involved in joint reality testing with the client. I believe he is now ready to challenge the system and to function as a client advocate by seeking a more clinical, comprehensive, and continuing role for himself.

10. The parameters of a dynamic relationship between the evaluator and the client must be explored on a theoretical level. The lack of even a vague model should not discourage our exploring theoretical issues. We can perhaps best do this if we focus on the gaps between "theory" and "practice." In theory, we are involved in a screening-in process. In actual practice, most vocational evaluation systems screen clients out of many potential vocational training and employment goals because of their focus on current functioning. Instead of a client's severe developmental need increasing attention, it tends to result in options being severely limited and success potential decreased.

11. Usdane has pointed out that very minimal use has been made of integrity groups in

vocational rehabilitation. Since integrity groups represent a major strategy for balancing the power of the evaluator with the weight of the group, we must assume that we have not really welcomed meaningful client participation. The prevailing practice of narrowing client options because of limited institutional training opportunities is directly contradictory to the rhetoric of "identified potential." This is perhaps best illustrated in how we utilize work samples. How often, for instance, do we seek to measure an improved performance on work samples, and relate to it, to the extent of positive interaction and resulting trust between the evaluator and client? Do we even go back to sample one after all the other samples are completed to test this hypothesis? Do we systematically try to increase the client's ability to make his own experiences? Do we recognize the reality of most evaluation leading to training rather than employment? Do we measure psycho-social abilities as well as task abilities as a means of developing client competency? Have we learned, as professionals, to focus on undeveloped ability rather than present ability to meet hypothetical community norms? Are we concerned with the client's need to test new behavior? Do we provide opportunities for peer support, Premarkian preferences, self-knowledge, and the knowledge that we need client success for our professional satisfactions?

12. On the important issue of the limitations of the evaluator's interpersonal skills, do we acknowledge that each person has a limited ability to respond in a differential way to various people? Do we structure vocational evaluation relationships so that different roles are assumed by different people? Does the evaluator assign other personnel and use other environments to create the appropriate client interaction? Minimum access by the evaluator to the means of changing structural barriers to his professional functioning is indicative of how great the gap is between rhetoric and reality.

13. We must respond to these questions with a frank dialogue on what needs to be done before we can claim professional status as clinicians. We must respond to the analogy between the roles of the clinical psychologist and the vocational evaluator as opposed to the roles of the vocational evaluator and the psychometrist. It is clear that we have already moved beyond the psychometrist in the scope and depth of our technical abilities, but we have not even applied basic behavioral management technology in a systematic way. We can only achieve professional status if we develop clinical tools and abilities. It is, however, not necessary for us to recapitulate the experience of clinical psychology with its historical preoccupation with diagnosis when it lacked an effective treatment modality. We do have effective and unique treatment tools. We can fuse the differential use of stimulus determinants in the work environment with developmental and learning methodology, to measure growth in the client's ability to function independently as a productive person.

14. Stone has challenged us to look at the sources of evaluator bias in performance appraisal. Usdane asks, "is there some way for the client to perceive that on the day he enters the facility, he received service? He might then share the excitement of immediate planning for the future."

15. A challenge to our field is to describe a longitudinal role for the evaluator, that is not completed until he participates in an evaluation of client outcomes, perceived as a measure of the effectiveness of his services. The strength of our interaction should be greater internalization and generalization by the client of shared, growth experiences.

16. Jones and McCandless have questioned whether evaluator training sufficiently reflects concern for the therapeutic impact of their personal interaction with the client. Jones has suggested that a dichotomy between clinical rehabilitation and counseling rehabilitation be developed. Are we prepared to become a major profession

60.

in the clinical rehabilitation field? Will we deliver a technical work evaluation, tailored to the needs of governmental purchasers of service, or will we become clinical professionals who are developmental in their approach to themselves and their clients?

JOHN J. KILLIAN

1. Helping handicapped people achieve the maximum potential of which they are capable has long been one of the major objectives of the vocational rehabilitation counselor. In order to do this, data has been needed, especially in the initial phases of the vocational rehabilitation process, relative to what activities the client can do, and what he might be expected to learn to do. The evaluator-counselor relationship evolved to a great extent as the counselor came to see, in many instances, that the client and he were unable to develop a rehabilitation goal. Generally, the more severe the handicap, the less likely the counselor has felt able to be of assistance, and when that feeling arose, he may have declared the client non-feasible for services--but that's another story. Having a group of clients for whom he had no answers may have motivated him to seek out the consultative services of the vocational evaluator.

2. Thus began one of the most vital relationships in the rehabilitation process. This over-simplification, of course, avoids tracing the evolution of vocational evaluation, and more importantly vocational evaluators, in that our task currently is to assess the state of the developments, as of today. Suffice it to say, that counselors felt a need for the assistance of their colleagues in evaluation, to help their clients and themselves, in determining suitable vocational objectives. As the liaison has developed, the more "difficult" cases in the counselor's caseload have found their way to the vocational evaluator. The relationship of the evaluator-counselor has, therefore, developed primarily to bring about the best possible services for the client.

DELIMITATING THE TOPIC

3. In reviewing the literature concerning the human dynamics of the evaluator and counselor, one finds remarkably few articles addressed to that particular topic, but in the few which are available, great changes are suggested over the past 16 years. Moed, et. al. (1957) suggest that the vocational counselor undertake the development and supervision of the pre-vocational unit, or what we would call today a rudimentary vocational evaluation unit. They go on to say, "There must be a feeling of interdependence as well as mutual respect for the other team members' professional focus." In those simpler bygone days when the vocational counselor may also well have been a vocational evaluator, especially if he worked in a residential as opposed to a field setting, communication between the two specialty areas was far less difficult, since the evaluator and counselor may well have been the same person. On this basis, all that the person needed to do was to talk with himself, and presto!, there was instant, (hopefully, accurate) communication between evaluator and counselor. The basic notion of interdependence and mutual respect seem to be as timely now as it was one-sixth of a century ago.

4. Gustad (1957) also sees the counselor as rendering at least some evaluation services. Five years later, Helfand (1960) uses the title "evaluators" for two persons, who were also vocational counselors, although their primary area is not mentioned.

5. Bregman's article (1967) clearly suggests that evaluators and counselors are not one and the same people, and he goes to some lengths in very cogently discussing the need for communication between counselor and evaluator, pointing out that a frame of reference needs to be established and questions asked to give direction to the evaluator and the evaluation process. Sankovsky (1969), in gathering data on rehabilitation counselor training programs and the vocational assessment process, found that 93% of

the coordinators of rehabilitation counselor training programs, who responded to his questionnaire, indicated a course in vocational evaluation for their students. This perhaps suggests a differentiation of services on the part of the professionals about to enter the rehabilitation services field, and also an attempt to provide the counselor with an appreciation of, and feeling for, the evaluation process.

6. The testee as co-evaluator is discussed by Fischer (1970) and provides an existentially oriented view in client relationships that stresses self-determinism and "partnership in the firm" for the client in vocational evaluation. This notion of having "three peers" working together on the evaluation model is different from the "two peers and client", and may be somewhat upsetting to the more traditional evaluator-counselor model. Wright's (1971) notion of advocacy may further influence the evaluator-counselor relationship. Burge (1972), in discussing the evaluator-counselor relationship, sees them as being interdependent, needing to communicate accurately on the identification of problems and assets. Articles by Ehrle (1967) and by Torrey (1972) suggest that under the skin, counselors and evaluators may be much the same--that is to say people workers--who assess and prescribe.

7. The last 16 years have seen a good many changes in the evaluator-counselor roles. Formally, vocational evaluation departments were, in some instances, developing within occupational therapy departments and relying on occupational therapists as evaluators, or in some cases were part of a sheltered workshop, relying on counselors as evaluators. Today, the programs of vocational evaluation appear to be separate entities and are primarily staffed by persons with the title of vocational evaluator, who often have graduate level training in the area. Homogeneity appears then to be one of the observable trends. Coupled with this has been a developing sense of identity amongst evaluators; wherein, they realized that they could make a unique contribution to the rehabilitation process, and that they were not just counselors interested in appraisal.

8. This evolution has also brought about changes in the perception of the counselor toward the evaluator. Counselors now tend to see vocational evaluation as a rehabilitation service which has matured or come of age. The colleagues in evaluation are seen by the counselors as making equal contributions in the rehabilitation process to themselves, occupational therapists, audiologists, physiatrists, speech pathologists, internists, social workers, and physical therapists, to mention only some of the specialty areas.

9. As the differentiation of roles has developed, evaluators see counselors as a vital link in the rehabilitation process and, often, as a coordinator of services given the task of synthesizing the findings of many different evaluators--vocational, medical, social, audiological, psychological, etc. Now that the participants know more about what each does, they feel more comfortable and are aware of their mutual contributions.

10. These personal observations are not to say that all has developed into sweetness and light between evaluators and counselors. Groups sessions and regularly scheduled discussion between evaluators and counselors seem to be beneficial in avoiding conflict and seeing that the client does not become an object of displacement. Communication between the evaluator and counselor is vital also to let each other know of any information germane to the evaluation or counseling aspects or, indeed, to the goals of the client.

11. Practice is based on sound theories. Theories tend to organize beliefs and assumptions, and tend to guide one's behavior. Theories evolve and are used as long as they are functional, or until a new set of theories are developed, which tend to be more functional. The point here being made is that theories are dynamic--they change as

knowledge is gathered and as hypotheses generated from the theories have been either supported or not supported by research. This notion of change is tremendously important to remember in thinking of vocational evaluation and the evaluator, but change has been equally rapid within the field of vocational rehabilitation counseling and the counselor.

12. With the differentiation of roles between evaluator and counselor--sometimes becoming greater and sometimes becoming lesser, and owing to agency needs at the time, the evaluator-counselor role has been at times strained. Ambiguity may result when one is not dealing in concretes, but in abstracts. Evaluators changing work settings, after having learned a certain relationship to an agency, where that former relationship is no longer appropriate, may have tended to find this upsetting. Comfort could be taken, however, as each of the practitioners realized that they were in the process of becoming specialized in their services and that each had a unique background of knowledge in their specific areas. New knowledge was continually being amassed and, with this accumulation, the practitioners could begin to feel more secure. With feelings of security developing, defensiveness, rigidity, authoritarianism, and bigotedness could be put aside.

13. The time may well have arrived when the state of the art and science in vocational evaluation, and especially the evaluator-counselor relationship, has acquired a broad enough theoretical base to enable some general postulates to be advanced. First is the notion that both counselors and evaluators are here to stay. Second is the belief that the two specialties have generally developed high regard for each other. Third is the suggestion that evaluation, evolved to fill a need in serving the more severely disabled clients, has probably made vocational rehabilitation feasible for thousands of clients, who in former years would have been considered non-feasible. Fourth, counselors and evaluators are more and more seen as specialists and, to a great extent, counseling and evaluation are not done by the same person. Fifth, graduate level training is available for both evaluators and counselors now, whereas originally counselors had more educational opportunities.

14. It is a basic notion that change involves pain. As evaluation has changed, and hopefully grown, the evaluator-counselor relationship may have had its share of that pain. Counselors were faced with admitting that they needed the assistance of evaluators. Admitting that we cannot be all things to all men can be a difficult act. Abdicating responsibility also entailed abdicating power. Human nature being what it is, and our culture being what it is, most people are not trying to decrease their power, and any decrease may be perceived as threatening to the counselor, as well as any other person. It is also worth noting that if the counselor's supervisor had directed the use of an evaluator by a counselor, who was reluctant to do so, the relationship probably began on shaky ground and deteriorated from there.

CONCLUSION

15. In order to evaluate the human dynamics of the evaluator-counselor relationship, several questions are offered: What are the pre-conceived images which the evaluator and counselor hold of each other? More basic even than this question is what are the pre-conceived images that the evaluator and counselor hold of themselves? Are these images accurate? How do they know they are accurate? What does accurate mean? Do evaluators and counselors understand each other's role? Do they understand their own roles? What is understood? What is role?

16. Are counselors willing to let evaluators be "counselors in residence", or do they merely want facts reported so that they might do the counseling and decision making after the evaluation process is over? Are counselors threatened by having evaluators do counseling? Do evaluators have training to do counseling? Are evaluators threatened by having evaluation done by counselors? Do counselors have training to do evaluation?

Is it possible for evaluators not to do counseling -- at least a small extent? Is it possible for counselors not to do evaluation -- at least a small extent? What differences, if any, exist in the evaluator-counselor roles between evaluators and field counselors as opposed to evaluators and facility counselors with whom they are in physical proximity?

17. Do counselors trust evaluators enough to share background data with the evaluators? Do evaluators trust counselors enough to share "all the data" with the counselor? Are there times when withholding of information by the evaluator or counselor from the other, prudent? How may the sharing of information be done so as to enhance the evaluator-counselor relationship?

18. Do evaluators and counselors honor each others education, experience, and intuitions? To what extent does intellectual snobbism pervade the relationship? How is the relationship effected by different academic levels of accomplishment--the master's level evaluator and the baccalaureate level counselor. The master's level counselor and the evaluator who completed studies at a trade school? Do you see any changes here?

19. It has been said that evaluators are now doing much of the work formerly done by counselors--say 5 or 6 years ago. This appears to be in addition to the usual tasks as evaluator. Many see the counselor's role as becoming one of a coordinator of activities. If this is so, how might the transfer of duties best be accomplished?

20. As the notion of Work Adjustment as a treatment modality comes to assume its rightful place as a means of effecting human behavioral change, a problem may arise as to which professional would best be suited to apply that treatment. Questions will doubtless arise as to whether the counselor would be better equipped to purvey the service, since work adjustment may be considered a treatment modality, equally as efficacious as is counseling, and specifically because it is just that -- a treatment. On the other hand, if evaluators are becoming more inclined to see themselves as treatment personnel as opposed to appraisal specialists, then conflict may arise. Perhaps work adjustment will ultimately see the development of a unique program to train its own practitioners. Until that day, however, the possibility for conflict between evaluator and counselor seems to exist. Perhaps a challenge to all of us is to get to know each other better. If counselors could join evaluators in their work for a few days, and evaluators assist counselors in their work for a few days, perhaps once or twice a year, each might have an increased appreciation of the contributions of the other. There is an old saying that suggests that we "... never judge a person until you have walked a mile in his shoes." This would seem to be good advice for counselors, evaluators, and all of us in the field to pursue.

ROBERT M. DAVIS

1. Vocational evaluation is quite dependent upon medical, psychological, and social data. The vocational evaluator suffers because other professionals do not have a basic understanding of what vocational evaluation means and encompasses. The vocational evaluator is in a peculiar position whose role as a distinct professional has not been fully accepted in the health and social science fields. His role is sometimes confused with rehabilitation counseling.

2. The vocational evaluator tries to obtain and synthesize data from other disciplines. He requests specific answers to questions about the client which enables him to make vocational recommendations. The use of data from other professionals is an essential tool of the evaluator. The evaluator would be unable to function without a thorough knowledge of a client's medical, psychiatric, psychological, and social history. The extent of the client's physical limitations, psychiatric diagnosis, family history, and educational achievement is of paramount importance to the evaluator, who uses this data to develop the client's vocational objectives, for ultimate training and employment.

OVERVIEW

3. Rosenberg (1970) states that the evaluator's role is amorphous and unclear in relation to other professionals. There is a need to establish effective communication with other professional disciplines if evaluators are to gain acceptance as a distinct profession. The vocational evaluator can develop levels of competency based on his knowledge, skills, and education. Continuing education can assist the evaluator to overcome his inadequacies and enlarge his role with other professionals.

4. Speiser (1970) feels that an essential component of vocational evaluation is diagnosis or identification of client needs and problems. The evaluator, though placing emphasis on work, must be completely objective and be concerned with the total needs of the client. If the evaluator lacks the skill or knowledge, he has the obligation of aiding the client to obtain appropriate services elsewhere. The services of other professionals must be requested with specific reasons for the referrals to these other disciplines.

5. Gorthy (1959), who was an early pioneer in the comprehensive team approach in rehabilitation, emphasizes the close integration between the work sample technique of evaluation and the medical profession. The physical evaluation and establishment of preliminary goals should be an initial step in any rehabilitation process. Further assessment is obtained through the physical therapy and occupational therapy evaluation, especially for neuromuscular disabilities. The medical assessment can assist the vocational evaluator in determining the client's physical capacities and limitations in terms of specific job areas. The physician can prescribe medical treatments to improve vocational performance, work tolerance, and prosthetic devices that will improve vocational performance. When the client nears the end of vocational evaluation, the physician can review the specific vocational recommendations to consider their compatibility with the long-term health needs of the client.

6. McGowan (1969) describes the purposes of medical evaluation in vocational rehabilitation which are: 1) to establish an impairment that materially limits the activities that the client can perform; 2) to appraise the current health status of the client with a view to determine his limitations and capacities; 3) to determine what medical services can remove, correct or minimize the client's disabling condition;

and, 4) to provide a realistic basis for selection of an employment objective that is commensurate with the disabled individual's capacities and limitations. There is a need for the evaluator to interpret and use medical, social, and psychological information appropriately. Through these professional services, he is better able to make vocational recommendations, with due consideration, to the total client and his problems.

PERSONAL OBSERVATION

7. The vocational evaluator, functioning in a rehabilitation facility, has grave difficulties working with other professionals outside his agency. The medical and psychological data obtained from these professionals does not answer the many questions that an evaluator has in working with the client. The data is not geared to provide the evaluator with up-to-date information on the client's present and future physical limitations and prognosis for work, the client's overall personality and how he gets along with people, and the family constellation and their feelings about the client's ability to go to work.

8. In general, the vocational evaluator has had no direct personal contacts with the outside physician, psychologist, and social worker. These professionals have never visited the facility and have little understanding of vocational evaluation. In most cases, contact has been made by telephone, and; other professionals seem unconcerned with the client's ultimate vocational objective. In emergency situations, it is difficult to get the outside professional, and; the vocational evaluator must make an immediate decision in handling a specific problem.

9. It is my opinion that evaluators have been lax in educating other professionals. They have expected others to know about vocational evaluation when they have done little to become involved with other professional groups and organizations, such as, A.P.A., AMA, APGA, N.A.S.W., A.O.T.A., etc. How can other professionals respect the vocational evaluator functioning in a rehabilitation facility when his role has not been clearly delineated? Evaluators are not clear concerning the nature of their role in rehabilitation. When they interact with physicians, social workers, psychologists and other professionals, they have a tendency to feel timid and exhibit a reluctance to express themselves freely. Evaluators fail to contribute the full measure of their skills and competence in education and the team process.

10. The functions and responsibilities of the physician, psychologist, psychiatrist, and social worker are clearly defined and understood by all professionals. The vocational evaluator's role as coordinator and synthesizer of information has been confused with the vocational counselor's role. In some agencies, the vocational counselor and the evaluator's role are combined into one position known as counselor-evaluator. He performs the duties and responsibilities of both professions, and assists the client toward a suitable vocational objective within his capabilities. There is a need for reaching the level of true cooperation between all professionals.

PRACTICE AND THEORY

11. The vocational evaluator must be flexible and prepared to meet each client's particular needs. He bears the responsibility to accumulate all the necessary data and determine the need and extent of medical, psychological, psychiatric, and social evaluations required to serve the client. He must know how to make use of the information obtained to help the client know and understand himself, and to help him arrive at a feasible vocational objective. This requires that the vocational evaluator understand his unique role in the rehabilitation process, and that the others participating understand theirs. The evaluator has a strong desire to be respected by all professionals.

12. The vocational counselor depends on the vocational evaluator to provide him with certain information that enables him to develop specific vocational recommendations for the client. The evaluator must integrate all pertinent information and relate it to an appropriate vocational goal.

13. The lives of professional people are molded by their chosen careers. Their roles determine the work they will do, the people they will associate with, the nature of their interpersonal relationships, and even their values and goals. Their roles determine, at least in part, what persons in other roles think of them. A professional person is not isolated. He works with colleagues on similar tasks and perceives himself and the others as members of the same group. A member of a profession may be secure or insecure in his relations with members of other professions. This security is a state in which a person feels that the needs he aspires to will be gratified, and will be satisfied, in a given relationship with others.

14. There is a need to develop, and mutually agree upon, a common set of goals for all professionals working together. In some cases, the functions, and role responsibility can be arranged so that the interactions of persons with those in different professions will satisfy mutual needs. Procedures must be organized and structured so that unsatisfactory relationships are identified, analyzed, and appropriate adjustments made. The functions a professional performs, and the required relations he has with others, specifically determine the nature of relationships and interaction. If a specific professional discipline accepts the vocational evaluator, this acceptance does much toward eliminating strain in his role relations.

SOME QUESTIONS

15. The major issues in clarifying the role of the evaluator and other professionals outside of the facility center around the following:

- 1) What is the role of each professional?
- 2) How can the vocational evaluator be considered an accepted member of the professional hierarchy?
- 3) How can the evaluator's contributions be recognized by outside professionals?
- 4) How can outside professionals know the specific services offered in vocational evaluation?
- 5) How can evaluators participate in professional meetings of other organizations?

CHALLENGE

16. The overall challenge to the rehabilitation field is: how can relationships be improved between the evaluator and other professional disciplines. The evaluator has not been truly accepted by other professionals on an equal basis in the same manner as medicine, psychology, social work, and counseling. The evaluator's role is misunderstood by most professionals and he is considered a disseminator of information on client's skills and aptitudes, with little consideration to his overall observations and impressions of personality and emotional adjustment of the client. There is a need to strengthen the evaluator's role with other professionals. Role relations are the key to professionals working together. Evaluators are faced with a basic dilemma in their relationships with other professionals, especially physicians and psychologists.

17. The basic challenge in rehabilitation is to help evaluators, who are in need of social interaction with other professional groups, examine the consequences of their acts for one another and plan ways of eliminating situational effects which cause

insecurity and strain in interpersonal relationships. The need to develop and agree upon a common set of goals for all professionals is absolutely essential. Through this commonality of goals and responsibilities, the vocational evaluator can achieve the status and acceptance as a contributing member of the professional team.

BERNARD ROSENBERG

1. The Human Dynamics between the Evaluator and the other members of the facility staff plays a vital role in the process of vocational evaluation in the facility offering comprehensive vocational evaluation services. This topic will relate to vocational evaluation practice which includes the use of work samples, vocational exploration by the evaluator, and situational assessment involving other members of the facility staff, with the purpose of predicting and identifying vocational goals for, and with, the client who is vocationally confused or has previously had no particular goals.

2. For the purpose of this paper, the Human Dynamics of the facility are those forces operating in, and between, the Evaluator and the other members of the facility staff, which affect the vocational evaluation of the client. Dynamics such as communication, interpersonal relationships, interaction, self-concepts, role concepts, attitudes, prejudices, moods, rapport, and morale should be considered as they relate horizontally and vertically. Positive human dynamics, operating between the Evaluator and other members of the facility staff, will result in the practical application and utilization of the knowledge of individual members of the facility staff, to achieve vocational evaluation of the client.

3. In review of pertinent literature, this coordinator found a significant lack of information and discussion on the subject of Human Dynamics between the Evaluator and the other members of the facility staff; i.e., Administration, Department Supervisors, and Para-professionals. The following paragraphs are concerned with the importance of communication and understanding of roles, with statements supporting the necessity for positive interaction between the evaluator and other members of the staff.

4. "Horizontal communication among Counselors/Evaluators is usually rather good in any agency, but the vertical flow up and down the hierarchy often leaves much to be desired. On the vertical plane, parts or all of messages may be lost and new ideas smothered or distorted". (Research and Demonstrations Brief, 1969). Barton (1971) states, "Many plans fail because key staff persons didn't realize they were supposed to carry out a certain action". Nadolsky (1972) found that, "Input of workshops personnel and job tryout supervisors allows the Evaluator to gather evidence concerning the overall feasibility of his tentative recommendations".

5. Howe (1963) defined communication as occurring "whenever there is a meeting of meaning between two or more persons. To achieve true communication between person and person, each must accept his own and the other's need for affirmation". Psychologists Brammer and Shostrom (1965) wrote, "If the Supervisor's energies are being dissipated in a continuous struggle to prove himself, or seek re-affirmation of his own importance, it will be difficult for him to devote energy to facilitating the development, or alleviating the problems of others".

6. Brammer and Shostrom further stated that, "Occupational information is more than facts about a job. It should be presented in terms of a way of life, of a relationship between worker and job and relationships among workers.... Most jobs require the client to conform to expectations, to be a team worker". Comment: This statement provides a valid rationale that the Evaluator and other members of the facility staff be cognizant of the need to maintain positive human dynamics within the facility. This is upheld in the reports of the International Labour Office (1970) on The Basic Principles of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled. One of the points outlined, that should emerge in a case conference with a team approach, was "Reactions to and relations with staff and disabled persons". The report re-affirms that each

facility staff member should understand all aspects of the program. Nadolsky (1972) editorialized, "Work behavior, like motivation, is a variable that relates directly to specific situations and varies with the situation. Work situations and experiences are real only to the extent that they are perceived by the individual as being meaningful and appropriate".

7. Whether the Evaluator is employed in a clinical setting or in a rehabilitation facility which incorporates the use of situational assessment as well as work samples and vocational exploration, it is the opinion of this writer that the Evaluator is the key person in the development of positive, human dynamics operating between himself, the client, and the other members of the facility staff.

8. The Evaluator's role is more clear-cut and specific than those of the other members of the facility staff. (1) Supervisors have production responsibilities, employee assignments and supervision in addition to the task of evaluation of clients in their departments. (2) The Para-professional or aide lacks professional training and the confidence which subsequently follows such training, making his role more dependent upon both the Evaluator and Supervisor for goal direction. (3) The Administrative Staff as program planners, developers, and policy making members of the organization should be, and are, firmly committed to the objectives of the vocational services within the facility. They are free to interact with individual Evaluators, but from my experience, more often rely upon the Administrator of Rehabilitation Services for the staff liaison with the Evaluators, and thus communication is often limited to brief informational or "brain-storming" sessions or casual conversation.

9. The facility in which I work has developed from operating a sheltered workshop, with evaluation and training service, to a comprehensive rehabilitation facility offering medical, psychological, social, vocational evaluation, work adjustment, training, and job placement services. Staff has increased from three (3) Administrative Staff Members, two (2) Professionals and five (5) Department Supervisors to Administration - eight (8), Professional - seventeen (17), Supervisor-Instructors - sixteen (16), Para-professionals - four (4). Included within the Professional group are four (4) Evaluators, three (3) Work Adjustment Counselors and one (1) Intake and Training Counselor. The Evaluator finds himself/herself coordinating and interacting with at least fourteen (14) different members of the facility staff in the evaluation process. Example: Intake Counselor → Medical (2) → Psychologist → Social Worker → Para-professional (Service Aide) → Department Supervisors (4-6) → Para-professionals, within departments (2) → Administrator of Rehabilitation Services and Placement Counselor. This may extend itself to include another member of the Administrative Staff, if training in one of the shop areas is being recommended. Upon assignment to a department, the Evaluator presents the client to the Supervisor. He also leaves a client profile sheet with the Supervisor, including such data as what the Evaluator is looking for, tentative goals and the client's physical, emotional or mental limitations, when appropriate. This is to promote mutual understanding and goals. The Evaluator is available for consult, planning, or counseling throughout the evaluative period. A standardized behavior rating scale sheet is prepared by the Supervisor weekly, or at the end of the one or two day evaluation period. Scheduled in-service training aids the Supervisors in their understanding of the use of this scale. The Supervisors and the other members of the staff, who are directly involved in the client's evaluation, attend the Staff Placement Conference, with the referring Vocational Counselor in attendance. The Evaluator is the team leader of the conference, but all staff members are free to contribute information, make recommendations, and experience being a part of the dynamic process of evaluation.

10. In order to promote and preserve a favorable climate for positive human dynamics, weekly in-service meetings are held. The Administrator of Rehabilitation Services, Director of Operations, Evaluation Supervisor, Work Adjustment Supervisor, Training

Counselor, Departmental Supervisors, and Para-professionals are in attendance. Periodically, other professionals and/or Administrative Staff members attend if the discussion subject is appropriate. In a questionnaire distributed to Evaluators, Supervisors, and Administrative Staff, areas of agreement were: (1) Understanding of goals of vocational evaluation; (2) understanding of the major role of Supervisor in evaluation; (3) understanding of the role of Evaluator; (4) Evaluator/Supervisors plan together, and feel they are part of the team; (5) In-Service Training beneficial. Variables included: (1) Supervisor attitudes regarding their role as boss, buddy, or counselor; (2) importance of production in the work-oriented facility; (3) relationship of Evaluator and Administrative Staff.

11. The Evaluator is the interpreter of the system to the other members of the staff. This is accomplished not only by sharing verbal and written vocational information and questions, but also by acceptance of others, of facility staff as team workers and by efforts to maintain horizontal relationships with Supervisors. Supervisors must accept the role of team worker, rather than allowing the Evaluator/Supervisor relationship to become vertical because of the concept of professional service versus production. The Evaluator, acting as a facilitator must be open, friendly, and must use language understood by the facility staff with whom he's relating. He must take into consideration the pressures, anxieties, and defenses of the individual staff member and be empathetic. The Evaluator should be the catalyst within the facility promoting positive human dynamics between the staff and himself to benefit the client. Thus, the Evaluator should be the key -- the coordinator, the interpreter, the facilitator, and the catalyst!

12. Evaluators and other facility staff members might readily agree that (1) an evaluation system exists, (2) there is a necessity for positive human dynamics operating within the facility, (3) there is a need to improve or change the system to enhance positive human dynamics. From that point, responsibility and reasons for the breakdown of positive dynamics is passed to and from Administration, Evaluator, Department Supervisors, and Para-professionals. To bring about improvement and change, Havelock (1969) suggests the need for social innovations that will create a human bridge between research and practice. Where do we begin? Change is painful, often disruptive, and resistance to proposed change can be great.

13. Utilization of research findings can be the answer to improvement and enhancement of the present systems by bringing together the practitioner and research in an inter-dependent relationship. Findings (Research and Demonstration Brief, 1969) indicate "utilization of research findings do not always require big programs or entirely new ways of doing things. Well-conceived minor changes can be very helpful". Havelock (1969) presented two methods of "Translating Theory into Practice". (1) Temporary systems of collaboration in which researches are brought together in seminars/conferences. The author gives a good example of "how it worked" in a Kansas City Conference. Essential ingredients were (a) both researcher and practitioner contributed to planning, (b) mutual agreement on what practitioner needed, (c) use of research evidence, practice, methods, models, consultants, (d) both worked on continuous analysis and feedback on the human relations of the process, and (e) documentation, evaluation, and follow-up. (2) The author continued with a recommendation for "change agents" within the system, who work toward full-time linkage of research and practice. The agent might work within large facilities or for the State Division of Rehabilitation, consulting with several facilities.

14. Some of the present "linking agents" which are readily available are (1) Research and Demonstration Briefs sponsored by the Research Utilization Branch, Division of Research and Demonstration, S.R.S., Dept. of H.E.W.; (2) Materials Development Center - Dept. of Rehabilitation and Manpower Services, University of Wisconsin-Stout. This is an information service providing up-to-date bibliography and short review of relevant literature, loan of monographs and audio-visual aids relating to vocational evaluation; (3) V.E.W.A.A. Bulletin; and other professional journals.

15. Human dynamics between the Evaluator/Facility Staff often produces results which can make or break the system. A positive example of research in this area was proven by Chicago Jewish Vocational Services, Research and Demonstration project (1972), Observation and Client Evaluation in Workshops - A Guide and a Manual. Twenty-two (22) agencies cooperated and tested one system. The advantages of the system described by agencies using it were (1) client evaluation instrument made observations of floor Supervisors more useful, (2) enhanced and improved communication, (3) elevated status of the Supervisor, (4) easier to organize discussion/planning for clients with available system framework, and (5) cut time for achieving objectives of service. One important finding was, "Evaluators/Counselors tended to accept the floor Supervisors on a more equal level when it came to understanding, evaluating, and planning for clients. This added considerably to staff cooperation".

16. As an Evaluator, you are part of a larger staff in your facility. These questions must be considered as you review this topic. (1) What is your relationship to the Administrators in your facility? (2) What is the Evaluator's relationship with the Supervisors? (3) What is the Evaluator's relationship with the Para-professionals or others of facility staff (with the exception of other professionals) with whom interaction occurs in the evaluation process? (4) Are relationships impaired by a "professional caste system" which relegates clients to a first level, co-workers to a second, professionals to a third and Administration to a fourth? (a) If so, why?

17. (1) What is the Evaluator's responsibility to other members of the facility staff? (2) What is the responsibility of the Evaluator to understand Administration/Supervisors/Para-professionals and their role in the facility? (3) Is planning/goal setting a joint responsibility? (a) If yes, whose joint responsibility is it? (4) What is, or should be, the responsibility of the Evaluator in the development of in-service programs geared toward improving or bettering staff relations?

18. Attitudes and perceptions often block communications. Example: "I cannot hear you because of what I expect you to say". (1) What is the responsibility of the Evaluator in developing communication and alleviating this perception? (2) How important is the Evaluator's attitude in relation to improving human dynamics between himself/herself and other staff facility members? (3) What attitudes and personal qualities do supervisors need (in addition to knowledge and skills of their field) to do their job well? (4) How does the Evaluator handle "mixed messages"? Example: Vertical - Administrator to Evaluator, → "Rehabilitation". Administrator to Supervisor, → "Production". Horizontal - Evaluator to Supervisor, → "Rehabilitation". Supervisor to Evaluator, → "Production/Rehabilitation"?

19. (1) How important are the human dynamics between Evaluator/Facility Staff in relation to vocational evaluation of the client? (2) Consider the factors involved in human dynamics within the facility and between the Evaluator/Facility Staff. (3) What alternatives should be considered by the Evaluator to achieve maximum, positive human dynamics between Evaluator/Facility Staff for the purpose of consistent service to the client? (4) What is the place of innovation and research on this subject?

20. Historically, proven knowledge and techniques are far ahead of the development of human relations, or acquisition of the social skills and processes which really make the system work. This seems to be the fact proven by the lack of literature on the subject of human dynamics in the evaluation process. As Evaluators in the field, you are responsible for the continuing development of effective client-centered vocational evaluation programs. Part of your challenge, as an emerging profession, is to become the catalyst in promoting the positive human dynamics between yourself and the other members of the facility staff for the benefit of your clients.

1. "What you see depends on where you stand" is perhaps the most succinct way of expressing the current state of the art of vocational evaluation. We are, in this national endeavor, attempting to come together and look at the whole area of vocational evaluation from a common stand. First, we need to bring together our experiences in the decision to refer to vocational evaluation, relative to their effectiveness and current contradictions. Second, we need to develop a common ideology that will provide a base for making competent decisions that will be applicable to, or at least understood by, all vocational evaluation settings and referral sources.
2. The myriad of seminars, editorials, and technical writing on the subject of vocational evaluation have discussed the importance of the referral decisions, but have not researched how it happens. Specific discussion of the effectiveness and current contradictions in the vocational evaluation delivery system, which begins with the decision to refer, has not been recorded by "ones who know" -- clients and service staff themselves. Therefore, writing on this topic is more professional opinion than research fact. For the review and discussion, this topic will be considered in terms of four issues: reasons for the decision, who participates, what takes place first, and when is it made.
3. Cundiff (1965) presents "reasons behind the decision" in a training manual for Vocational Rehabilitation staff which discusses guidelines, advantages, and disadvantages to be considered. This issue has been dealt with using clinic judgements of objective (as well as some subjective) criteria. Determining validities of criteria used in vocational evaluation decisions are discussed by Barton (1972).
4. Who ought to participate in the decision to refer to vocational evaluation has received some editorial comment. Olshansky (1969) has written on the client as decision-maker. Messenger (1969) points out the decision-making role of the rehabilitation counselor, contending that, the very clients in need of vocational evaluation are often unable to make decisions by nature of their brain damage or psychosis. Krantz (1968) makes the case for the evaluator as a major participant in structuring the referral process; he best knows the scope and limit of his service. Multi-agency participation is discussed by Truelson (1970), in his summary of the "Work Evaluation Center Project" in Oregon, in which the State Rehabilitation, Welfare, and Manpower agencies each participate to refer clients to Centers operated by all three agencies.
5. What takes place prior to the decision to refer to vocational evaluation has been described by Whitten (1970), in his interpretive comments on Section 15 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. First is the preliminary screening to determine that a client has an employment handicap and needs a service. Second is a comprehensive evaluation of pertinent medical, psychological, vocational, educational, cultural, social, and environmental factors of employment. Third is the decision to refer to vocational evaluation. Fourth are goods and services to be provided as needed throughout.
6. There are several approaches in the literature to the issue of when to refer to vocational evaluation. Neubauer (1970) alludes to the early and routine referral to vocational evaluation in the Florida school system, in a preventative approach. Bitter (1966) stresses a client-centered, flexible approach, with client-readiness determining when to refer. A third approach is the coordination of vocational evaluation with an

initial job placement, on the premise that placement in paid, meaningful activity provides the immediate need gratification necessary for client motivation in the vocational evaluation. Both Taylor (1970) and Olson (1963) advocate this approach; Taylor in his delivery system model for use by disadvantaged clients, and Olson in her discussion of work relief as vocational evaluation.

7. Discussing the issues to be dealt with in the decision to refer to vocational evaluation is an overwhelming task. First, the vocational evaluation setting has to be considered. Are we talking about school vocational exploration programs, manpower orientation, rehabilitation centers, work relief, or hospital occupational therapy? Second, the referral source is important. Differing standards and pay structures affect generalization about the decision-making process in a referral to vocational evaluation.

8. Based on observation and experience as a client service worker in four agency settings (a county welfare department, school system, a state vocational rehabilitation agency, and a rehabilitation center), the need for multi-agency cooperation in services to clients has become all too clear. Two common criticisms of decisions that have been made in referring clients to vocational evaluation at the Minneapolis Rehabilitation Center (MRC) have been 1) lack of adequate predetermination and statement of specific reasons for the referral, and 2) lack of adequate preparation of the client and arrangement of support services during the evaluation.

9. To deal with the first problem, MRC developed a Diagnostic Interviewing training course (4-72), originally, to train State employment service through older worker specialists. The interview outline zeros in on problem areas, so that specific reasons for a vocational evaluation referral can be identified with less terminology hang-ups. A Relocation Project and manual were developed (12-72) to deal with the second problem, with the cooperation of the State Rehabilitation agency, changing their state plan to include payment of services for significant others, apartment deposits, and moving expenses. The reason for referral and preparation, needed prior to the decision to refer, are spelled out in the manual.

10. An additional issue relative to the decision to refer to vocational evaluation, that has shown up from experience, is the denial of vocational evaluation to a client for whom the decision was made. An example from each of three settings follows:

Example from a Welfare setting

A disadvantaged client receiving county relief was referred to the state vocational rehabilitation agency (state VR), and the decision was made that a comprehensive vocational evaluation was needed. However, the client had no identifiable disability that could be labeled according to the state VR eligibility requirements. The county welfare board would not pay the high cost plus room and board or transportation for the nearest vocational evaluation center, and there was no work relief vocational evaluation program available through that county.

Example from a school setting

A 15-year-old student had behavior problems which first led to expulsion from school, and then, the tutor provided could not handle him. He was referred to the state VR counselor who interested him in a vocational evaluation center that had a certified teacher to satisfy education requirements. Because the student was under 16, State VR funds were not available. The school system was then considered a source from which to obtain funds. Although the school system was willing to pay for the student's education requirements, it would not finance his vocational evaluation. Because the school he would attend would not provide vocational evaluation, he would not accept the education.

Example from a state VR setting

An 18 year old, severely disabled from degenerative muscular dystrophy, applied for VR services. A vocational evaluation was planned as a means to placement in meaningful work activity. However, the terminal disability prohibited state VR agency acceptance for services, and the parents could not afford the vocational evaluation center cost.

11. A common thread runs through each of these case samples. In each case the need for vocational evaluation was determined, but the availability of vocational evaluation that would fit the particular agency's structure was lacking, or the facility to fit the client's need was lacking. The decision to refer to vocational evaluation cannot be made unless there is a vocational evaluation to refer to. Nor can the decision be made under present fee structures by a client who is not first attached to a referral agency, who either provides it or will finance it elsewhere.
12. What are the reasons for deciding to refer to vocational evaluation? Theoretically, there could be several approaches to the decision. One approach might be standardized use of the VR training guidelines as discussed by Barton (1965 & 1972). Another might be routine referral after comprehensive diagnostic interviews have identified problem areas. In practice, reason for the referral are too often not communicated effectively, nor based on the client's real needs. Specific reasons for referral are clouded by the request for a "general evaluation", or there has been no specific evaluation need identified at all. Large caseloads sometimes result in wholesale referral of unprepared clients, in which case the reason for referral is "comprehensive evaluation which I could do myself if I had time." With Social Security Disability Insurance applicants or Workman's Compensation claimants, the reasons are well defined: to determine specific job possibilities, physical capacities and/or retraining potential. When the evaluation unit is under the same roof as the referral source, the reasons are also better communicated.
13. Who participates in the decision to refer to vocational evaluation? Theoretically, the client would decide, after receiving adequate diagnostic preparation from the referral source, and with relevant support personnel participating by providing collateral services as needed. The referral source would advise the client on the basis of a thorough understanding of the available vocational evaluation services, their appropriateness, and proximity. Included would be what the evaluation can and cannot provide, which suggests the evaluator as a crucial participant in the decision to refer. In practice, the client is seldom given the opportunity to decide, especially if the referral source decides the costs are too high. The referral source often does not communicate effectively to the client about what vocational evaluation can provide, so, the client passively accepts rather than participates in the decision. Or, for various reasons, relevant support personnel do not agree to cooperate in providing goods and services, without which the client is out of luck.
14. What takes place before the actual decision is made? Theoretically, the proposed referral would be preceded by a consideration of all pertinent medical, psycho-social, and vocational information from all relevant sources. Additional psychological testing would be obtained, if needed. Following a realistic appraisal of this information (or lack of information), the determination would be made regarding the necessity for a vocational plan. In practice, however, there are communication gaps, time lags, or lack of access to an appropriate vocational evaluation service, which delay or even block the proposed decision to refer.
15. When is the decision made to refer to vocational evaluation? Theoretically, the decision would be made early with a client early in the vocational planning, not when all else has failed. In practice, about the only time this happens is in schools or

institutions where the evaluation units are under the same roof, do not require special fees, and not a lot of red tape to get in to them. But in other referral agencies the processing of a client often eliminates the possibility of early intervention, with the client, in turn, losing faith in all agency systems.

16. "How does the client get selected for this expensive technology (vocational evaluation), and what is he like? The questions are legion, and the answers must not be long delayed." Krantz asked these questions in an editorial in the first VEWA Bulletin published the winter of 1968. They are still unanswered, but the three year VEWA Project, begun in 1972, has included these issues as an integral part of the study.

17. Who is the client? What is vocational evaluation? Who is the referral source? What are the relevant supportive services and who provides them? To discuss this topic, we will first have to come together and see these terms from a common stand. Is the client any handicapped individual, or only one with a diagnostic label, who has come to the attention of a referral source that has the capacity to pay for a vocational evaluation? Is the vocational evaluation in a public or private facility using simulated work samples, or does it include evaluation programs in schools, hospitals, and institutions? Are we including vocational evaluation services sponsored by welfare departments, state employment services, and private insurance companies? Are we defining supportive services to include family and significant others, or only professional personnel? Are we talking about services in other than vocational areas, such as personal, social, recreational, medical, and educational? In other words, how broad or narrow a definition are we going to consider in dealing with this whole issue of vocational evaluation?

18. It is our challenge to bring some workable framework to the nebulous decision-making process that exists in the referral, "of the client, for the client, and by the client" to vocational evaluation. We must describe reality to enable ideals, based on our experiences and observations, re-defining those realities into a model for an effective, noncontradictory, decision-making process.

19. It is no small task to change "what you see depends on where you stand" to "what you see is exactly what I see". But this is what is necessary, if we are to clean up our language and develop an effective foundation upon which to make competent decisions to refer to vocational evaluation.

AVIS PETERSON

State of the Art

1. At the present time, vocational evaluation is practiced, or mispracticed, in a variety of educational, industrial, and rehabilitation settings. These settings vary in scope, nature, size and purpose. The evaluator may be called upon to assume a number of different roles, depending on the type of setting and the nature of the clients involved in the evaluation process. In viewing vocational evaluation from a broad perspective, it must be recognized that the term, vocational evaluation, is used loosely and defined vaguely in many settings. Definitions are usually stated in terms of evaluation techniques and approaches, and not in terms of evaluating human potential; this is evidenced by the fact that, in many settings, clients proceed through identical evaluations.

2. Many vocational evaluators in rehabilitation settings have difficulty in conceptualizing vocational evaluation in other types of settings serving individuals without substantial physical or mental disabilities. They may still have a vocational, social, or educational handicapping condition presenting a barrier to the achievement of a maximum functioning level of society.

3. The concept of vocational evaluation differs in various settings; for example, it may vary from a diagnosis in learning disability unit to a general assessment in a technical training center. A job-oriented sheltered workshop may have different goals for their vocational evaluation programs than a comprehensive rehabilitation center. Some rehabilitation settings evaluate clients for specific jobs or training areas available in their setting; others may evaluate clients for specific jobs, training adjustment problems, or educational objectives. The settings which provide a "comprehensive" program of vocational evaluation usually also have a comprehensive program of services available for clients, either in the facility or in the community.

4. The relationship between a vocational evaluation program and other programs, in a particular setting, depends on its impact on the goals of the organization. In many settings, vocational evaluation has been an added component with great expectations, inadequate preparation prior to implementation, and very little training for the vocational evaluator. It is usually considered the vocational assessment component of the organization and the initial phase in the delivery system of services. The goals of the vocational evaluation unit are governed by the philosophy of the evaluator, evaluator-client ratio, expectations of the referral sources, limitations of the physical setting, as well as other variables.

Research and Review of Literature

5. A review of professional literature revealed very little information concerning the process of vocational evaluation in various types of settings. There are descriptions of educational, industrial, and rehabilitation settings with vocational evaluation units. This description usually involves goals, such as "determining vocational potential," and listings of approaches and methods such as psychometric testing and evaluation systems. There is a noticeable absence of research in vocational evaluation, relating to its effectiveness in various types of settings.

Nature of Settings

6. It was in the typical rehabilitation settings, such as the comprehensive rehabilitation centers and sheltered workshops, that vocational evaluation became established as a recognized service in rehabilitation. Due to a period of rapid, unsupervised growth, vocational evaluation became established in these settings under a variety of names, conditions, and definitions. Also, a variety of techniques and approaches have complicated the understanding of vocational evaluation in rehabilitation settings. In most rehabilitation facility settings, vocational evaluation occupies a major function in the provision of vocational services.

7. In medical settings, the concept of evaluation is sometimes translated into a physical capacity appraisal as determined by a physical therapist, or work tolerance assessment by an occupational therapist. These assets and limitations may or may not be then related to vocational objectives and job potential. Sometimes evaluation is conceptualized as a process of determining behavioral and adjustment problems and recommending treatment programs; sometimes this is evident in mental health centers, community programs for discharged mental patients, half-way houses for alcoholics, etc. Even though a vocational assessment will take place later on, the concept of evaluation is primarily centered around the reality of personal and social adjustment problems.

8. Vocational evaluation in programs for the mentally ill are complicated by the nature of the disability that changes due to psychiatric treatment, unpredictable public attitudes, and the lack of a definable, correctable handicap. In settings involved with the mentally retarded, the vocational evaluation process involves a series of structured learning experiences extended over a period of time. These complex variables have necessitated a trial-and-error evaluation process, utilizing institution work programs, activity centers, job try-outs, and sheltered workshops.

9. Some educational settings have initiated programs of vocational evaluation in an attempt to cope with students or clients that had been previously screened out of their service program. Vocational high schools and technical educational centers have received the mandate to serve the occupational needs of handicapped individuals, disadvantaged persons, and those individuals who were deprived of the opportunity to participate in technically-oriented programs. Cooperative agreements between public schools and state vocational rehabilitation agencies have established vocational evaluation in special educational settings. Evaluators, in these settings, are charged with determining a psychological-educational-vocational diagnosis and recommending a long-range program of services.

10. Recent emphasis on correctional rehabilitation necessitated the advent of vocational evaluation to institutional and community settings, involved in rehabilitation efforts with the public offender. In these settings, the evaluator must be willing to adapt and change to accurately assess a population of relatively young juvenile delinquents and adult offenders with antisocial behavior and authority problems. Successful evaluation efforts are initiated while the client is incarcerated, and utilize work release and realistic job tryouts when this is possible.

11. Manpower programs, such as WIN and NYC, have realized the importance of providing vocational evaluation services to many of their disadvantaged clients, prior to implementing vocational placement or training. Social welfare programs are becoming also interested in involving vocational evaluation, to a greater degree, with

AFDC recipients in order to determine self-support potential and realistic planning for training and/or employment. This expansion, in the need for evaluation, will be a severe test for the existing rehabilitation settings, providing vocational evaluation services.

12. A recent study by Nadolsky (1971) explored the nature of vocational evaluation programs, for the disadvantaged, external to traditional rehabilitation settings. The majority of these facilities maintained formal or structured programs of vocational evaluation. About half of these settings indicated the major objectives of their vocational evaluation process, included determining employability potential and establish appropriate vocational objectives for their clients. Most of the remaining facilities specified major objectives, such as: involving an assessment of aptitudes, abilities worker traits, and work behavior of each client; a process designed to relate findings orient clients to specific occupational requirements was also an objective.

13. Vocational evaluation also takes place in settings concerned with individuals who are unlikely to be remuneratively employed in competitive employment. Evaluation serves the purpose of recommending activity programs designed for constructive and meaningful living. These evaluation efforts are being directed toward a population of older, disabled persons, the very severely handicapped, and others. The evaluation objectives for these individuals center around sheltered employment, service groups, volunteer services, community programs, and leisure activities.

14. Many other types of settings that have incorporated vocational evaluation into their programs could also be discussed at this point. However, most of them have some of the same characteristics, objectives, and problems as those that have been previously discussed in this section.

Questions for Consideration by the Forum

15. What should be the scope of vocational evaluation in various settings? Should it be confined to vocational potential? To what extent should the vocational evaluation assess the psycho-social aspects of the individual? Should the specific setting, by its nature of services and clients, determine the scope of vocational evaluation?

16. With the increasing variety of settings providing vocational evaluation, how can evaluators communicate with each other concerning goals, objectives, techniques, approaches, and process? In what ways could manpower, rehabilitation, education, and social welfare agencies contribute to a body of knowledge in vocational evaluation? How can vocational evaluation attain a unified, professional direction with so many different settings involved?

17. Recently, vocational evaluation units have been created in numerous settings without regard to the training and experience of the individual selected as the evaluator. In what ways can this policy contribute to the inconsistency in the effectiveness and quality of evaluation programs?

18. What type of training is needed by new or inexperienced evaluators that would assist them in providing vocational evaluation services in a variety of settings? How can in service training involving evaluators, from various settings, advance the professional status of the vocational evaluator? What are the pros and cons of certifying, in some manner, vocational evaluators that work in various settings?

19. Explore the basic differences between formal and informal programs of vocational evaluation. Which types of settings have formal programs of vocational evaluation? Which ones have informal programs? Compare formal and informal programs in terms of advantages and disadvantages from the clients' point of view?

20. Regardless of the setting providing vocational evaluation, its relationship with the referral sources and/or funding agency determines the nature of the program and the identity of the evaluator. To what types of settings would this statement apply and not apply, at the present time? How are goals, in the settings previously discussed, of vocational evaluation units related to the total setting (rehabilitation facility, institution, vocational training school, etc.)?

21. Consider the need for vocational evaluation in various settings concerned with developing human potential. What types of individuals, who do not normally receive a vocational evaluation, are in need of this service? How can a program of vocational evaluation be best implemented in these settings?

22. At the present time, various settings claim to provide a comprehensive program of vocational evaluation services. Can one rehabilitation, education, etc. setting provide all the components of a comprehensive program of vocational evaluation? Discuss the feasibility of having such a comprehensive program without some type of simulated or "real" work environment. What are the essential components of a comprehensive vocational evaluation program?

Challenge to the Forum

23. A challenge is being issued to this forum to explore and gain some perspective to the milieu in which vocational evaluation takes place. This paper has been written in an effort to stimulate thinking about vocational evaluation from an expanded viewpoint of many different settings and, also, discussion of issues concerned with the vocational evaluation process in various settings.

24. Be creative in making conclusions, suggestions, proposals, and recommendations. Obtain additional information concerning various settings providing vocational evaluation services. Find out who others are in these settings, who are functioning as evaluators, in order to gain a better perspective of their roles, identity, and concept of evaluation. This resource paper is not intended to be all inclusive; treat it as a starting point for your forum discussions.

HORACE W. SAWYER

1. Vocational evaluation programs were established primarily for the purpose of expediting the delivery of rehabilitation services to handicapped clients. With the growth and increased demand for this service, the functions of counselors, psychologists, physicians, and other personnel were altered to a significant degree, but most important, vocational evaluators became a rehabilitation profession. As vocational evaluation developed, many attempts were made to delineate the responsibilities of the individual evaluation team members; however, few efforts were directed to defining the role of the client, or his right to participate in his own evaluation program.

2. Few service areas have greater impact on rehabilitation clients than does vocational evaluation since future services often depend to a large extent upon the results of psychological, medical, social, and vocational assessment. Nevertheless, in all too many cases, services are dispensed without regard for the feelings of the client. The client and his needs should be the primary concern of evaluation personnel, especially if the primary objective of vocational evaluation is to serve handicapped individuals. Therefore, the client's needs, as far as possible, should take precedence over those of agencies, facilities, and counselors. Simply stated, the client must play a significant part in the total assessment process, if vocational evaluation is to be relevant and effective.

3. The particular subject "Client Participation in Evaluation" is sure to create some disagreement among evaluation personnel. Although all professionals are verbally committed to the client as an active member of the evaluation team, there is little evidence that this is carried out in actual practice. It seems that the client receives services that are determined by professionals, rather than the services he feels will best meet his individual needs.

4. Much has been written and said about client participation in evaluation. Although all presentations seem to emphasize a client-centered approach, the reality of this in actual practice is subject to question. Undoubtedly, the setting of the unit, staff, and resources available influence the role of the client and the ultimate vocational decision. Small workshops with limited resources and staff, by necessity, will greatly restrict the extent of client participation, while comprehensive, well-staffed facilities with unlimited resources should enhance a more active client role.

5. In reality, how much self-direction the client will assume depends upon the qualifications and security of the staff. A strong, confident, and secure staff will not determine the client's service needs in isolation, but will include him as a contributing member of the total evaluation team throughout the evaluation process. In this approach, the client is not viewed as an object to be manipulated, but as an individual deserving of dignity and respect. In other words, the competent vocational evaluator will create an atmosphere of warmth and acceptance, which will encourage client growth and self-directions.

6. A rather comprehensive review of existing literature, accompanied by personal observations and contact with vocational evaluators, supports the fact that active client involvement in the process enhances rehabilitation outcome.

Nevertheless, active client participation raises several pertinent questions. To what degree should the client provide directions for his own program? Does he provide information in reference to his needs and how these needs can be met? Is a client somewhat free to select the evaluation program that he feels will best meet one's needs? What voice should one have in the final recommendations for future services? Seemingly, all concerned agree that the client is a valuable resource in evaluation, nevertheless; the individual may be the most neglected ingredient in the assessment process.

7. Since vocational evaluators assess the client's rehabilitation potential, and make recommendations to the counselor for a job or vocational training program consistent with the evaluation results, their responsibility to the client is staggering. However, many vocational evaluators establish a paradigm of counseling the client into a vocational area completely opposite to his real interest (an example, accounting rather than mechanics). In retrospect, such actions appear directed toward the needs of the evaluator rather than the client. Moreover, the evaluator developed hypotheses for the client and concluded his program by making the final vocational decision. Perhaps, more involvement and better assessment of the client's needs and interest would have prevented this type of situation from occurring.

8. In addition to the factors previously mentioned, the extent the client can participate or direct his own program depends upon intellectual ability, emotional stability, mobility, insight, and degree of freedom granted by vocational evaluators. Basically, however, if vocational evaluation is to attain its objective, and effectively serve the client, then this individual must be deeply involved; nevertheless, considerations must be given to all restrictive or limiting aspects. All of this is to say, if evaluation is to succeed, the process must be observed from an internal frame of reference, the client, and an external frame of reference, the vocational evaluator and/or other evaluation personnel.

9. From a personal viewpoint, it appears that the clients are evaluated for training areas or jobs that exist in the facility or the local community. Therefore, vocational evaluation is not as comprehensive as is often implied. This, in itself, restricts client participation. Further suggested is that the client may have little voice in the selection of evaluation units and complied with the decision of the referring counselor rather than be denied needed services. All too many clients that are admitted for vocational evaluation are under the impression they are enrolling for a definite training program. Needless to say, these clients are not prepared to assume responsibility for their evaluation program.

10. Based on personal experience it seems that the rehabilitation client's participation in his own evaluation program is minimal. Nevertheless, several factors come to mind that could enhance client acceptance of greater responsibility for vocational assessment. These include: Better planning and orientation on the part of the referring counselor; careful selection of evaluation unit; more attention to the client's expressed interest; an in-depth orientation to the evaluation process; and conducting a broad and comprehensive program to expose the client to an increased number of vocational areas.

11. Much of the topic, "Client Participation in Evaluation," is subjective and abstract which makes it difficult to discuss in concrete terms. Ideally, the client's role could be described much as the vocational evaluator, counselor, or psychologist, but unfortunately there are too many variables that influence participation. On paper, all presentations emphasize client participation and responsibility, as well as encouraging consideration of the client as a contributing member of the

evaluation team; however, theory and practice are far apart on the evaluation continuum.

12. As stated previously, the client, the person most directly concerned with the outcome of evaluation, is often overlooked or neglected by professionals in planning delivery of rehabilitation services. If vocational evaluation is to be valid, the client must accurately feel that he is an important member of the evaluation team. In a few instances, it has been recommended that the client serve as co-manager of his own case, as far as his abilities and limitations permit. It would be difficult to take issue with this suggestion since the way the client views his future is the primary variable in any rehabilitation program. Theory and practice again, however, appear to be two different matters.

13. Regardless of how realistic the vocational evaluation is made to appear, the client still sees himself as client and not as a productive worker. In this role, the client experiences a considerable amount of anxiety, as all people do when they are subjected to any type of evaluation by other individuals. In addition, as evaluation findings are uncovered, the client is seldom informed of his performance, and has little idea of the direction his program is taking. In the evaluation process there seems to be few provisions for the client to utilize the evaluation results to formulate his own decisions.

14. Summarizing the theories and their relationships to actual practices in reference to the client's role in vocational evaluation, there is strong evidence that a wide chasm exists between the two. Nevertheless, theory and practice can be brought closer together with a great deal of work on the part of this project's participants.

15. Provided vocational evaluation is to be a meaningful service program, the roles of the personnel must be delineated, methods and techniques defined, and realistic goals and objectives established for the unit. Finally, the role the client will play as the recipient of services must be clarified with little room for misunderstanding. Needless to say, this applies equally to the referring counselor and the evaluation staff. The very nature of the rehabilitation process demands that defining the client's role begins with the referring counselor. Therefore, the questions are: What are the counselor's responsibilities? What is the function of the client? What should be the process of selecting an evaluation unit?

16. When service needs have been identified, and a plan for service delivery formulated, an evaluation unit must be selected to the mutual satisfaction of both client and counselor. The questions developed here are: What role does each play in developing a meaningful program? How can the client maintain some control or direction for his own evaluation program? Should hypotheses be developed at this point in time in reference to work or training?

17. During the vocational evaluation program, there are many instances that active client participation can be encouraged. Specific questions for consideration are: What factors enhance, or restrict, the client's role? What degree of responsibility should the client have in directing his case and in the selection of evaluation tests for specific vocational areas? Should the client view the test results, including psychologicals, as they are recorded? Should the client participate in case conferences that relate to his own evaluation program?

18. At the conclusion of vocational evaluation, many situations arise and pose pertinent questions for consideration by vocational evaluation personnel, namely: What about the client reading the final evaluation report? What alternatives should the client have (not the one he has) if he disagrees with the report, evaluator/counselor interpretations? Who should plan and formulate rehabilitation services after evaluation, the client, the evaluator, the counselor or all personnel involved? A final question, What can be done to increase client responsibility or what role can the client actually play in the vocational evaluation process?

19. For numerous reasons, rehabilitation has changed, and, as a result, vocational evaluation must change in order to keep pace. Today, it is not known for certain whether or not the various techniques utilized in the evaluation process are the most appropriate to adequately evaluate handicapped individuals. In recent years, services have been extended to clients previously ineligible. Moreover, it is without question that additional disadvantaged and severely disabled clientele will qualify for services in the near future. The challenge to the field is complex -- what can be done to insure better client participation? In order to accomplish this objective, what changes would need to be made in the evaluation process, in techniques, in personnel, in psychological assessment, in staffings, and the functions of present evaluation staff?

20. Perhaps this very complicated topic can be made less difficult by reviewing the general evaluation process, and the role the present client plays at various intervals. Each vocational evaluation unit should develop a plan of action that will have a definite impact on counselors and evaluation staff, but even more important, one that will emphasize greater client participation.

B. DOUGLAS RICE

1. The validity and use of vocational evaluation findings have been a subject of controversy among rehabilitation and other professional workers for several years. Depending on your particular definition of vocational evaluation, its validity depends on the aspects it purports to discover. According to Rice (1972), vocational evaluators should diagnose vocational problems and then prescribe procedures, methods, and programs that will remedy or alleviate these deficiencies. Many others include determining rehabilitation potential, particularly work potential, as a major objective. Yet, this very important function is being performed in innumerable ways and by variously qualified individuals.
2. Suazo (1965) described evaluation as the key to rehabilitation. However, Nadolsky (1971) reported it questionable whether a systematic body of knowledge exists for the field of vocational evaluation. If this is true, then it is extremely important for vocational evaluation programs to demonstrate their efficacy if they are to warrant usage by rehabilitation and other agencies.
3. In order for a profession to establish itself, there must be a systematic body of knowledge supported by meaningful research. However, as Clark (1969) reported, there is an appalling lack of supportive research. Spergel (1970) believes that vocational evaluators have rationalized against studying vocational evaluation outcome and those studies that have been done are poorly designed. Overs (1970) has also found little research reported in scientific journals, and advocates a publication that will bring together research findings. Most likely, many rehabilitation agencies and facilities have done self-studies of their vocational evaluation programs, but have reported their results in obscure project reports or unreleased documents.
4. There have been several studies on the utility of job sample tasks, psychological tests, and evaluator ratings of clients. Overs (1970) has done a commendable job in summarizing these findings. He also reviewed research on total assessment scales, which purport to predict success in training, in placement, and in employment. There has been only one comprehensive assessment of the vocational evaluation process. Jewish and Vocational Employment Service of Philadelphia (1968) completed an ambitious project to measure the efficacy of their vocational evaluation program. Using both experimental and control groups, it was found that clients who participated in work evaluation, prior to employment counseling and placement, had a better vocational outcome, and counselors and clients were favorable toward this program.
5. There have been numerous studies on vocational outcome or success of rehabilitation programs. Neff (1960) studies the success of the Chicago J.V.S. program and found the predictions of the staff regarding placeability and employability were generally upheld, and that the family was important in the client's vocational adjustment. Phelps (1965) evaluated the program at the West Virginia Rehabilitation Center and found that 85% of 50 DVR counselors surveyed found their mentally retarded clients, who were evaluated at the Center, easier to work with than other mentally retarded clients in their caseload. Campbell & O'Toole (1970) obtained the reactions of 238 former clients at Cleveland's Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services who had been judged unemployable and untrainable by conventional rehabilitation methods before entering the program. When asked what they thought of the work adjustment program, 24% indicated "excellent," 47% "somewhat helpful," 15% "neutral," 12% "waste of time," and 2% "detrimental."
6. The importance of the family, agency, and other variables in validating vocational evaluation findings was pointed out by Brolin & Wright (1971) who studied the extent to which five types of recommendations from an evaluation center for the retarded were implemented and variables related to their implementation. It was found that only 60% of the vocational recommendations were "definitely" followed, and that many other important

rehabilitation recommendations either were only partially followed, or were not followed at all for a large number of mentally retarded clients. Different patterns of variables were found to influence the five types of recommendations made (i.e., social, medical, psychological, educational, and vocational). The influence of the family on the implementation of all types of recommendations was an important finding. A further study on the same clients (Brolin, 1972) found client outcome to be particularly related to the interaction of certain client, family, community, and agency variables. It was also found that a large number (1/3) of clients received inadequate services after evaluation and, of those receiving adequate services, about 1/3 of the males and almost 1/2 of the females failed to reach their assessed vocational outcome potential.

7. There are several other problems that have precluded assessing the validity of vocational evaluation programs. One of these has been the inability to gain universal agreement about what constitutes vocational evaluation, and how it should be done. This is unfortunate because if we are to develop a systematic body of knowledge on the subject, train people to be evaluators, design vocational evaluation programs, and then determine the validity of their efforts, we had better have some agreement on what it is we are supposed to be doing.

8. This confusion is apparent when one observes the interaction between state rehabilitation agency and rehabilitation facility personnel. In many instances, rehabilitation counselors are very "uptight" about facility programs, including the evaluation aspect. Often they feel the evaluation is very limited, unsophisticated, and too costly. They complain about insufficient reports and other communications of client progress and potential. They feel that clients are often left in the programs too long just to get the referring agency's money (Brolin, 1973).

9. There are wide degrees of variance in vocational evaluation philosophy and technique among programs. Some have very constricted definitions and programs, whereas others are quite encompassing. But one thing that is almost always missing is any systematic assessment of what they do. Another phenomenon that occurs is the lack of knowledge rehabilitation counselors and other referring personnel have about vocational evaluation and other aspects of facilities. One other problem is the lack of client knowledge and involvement in decisions about one's own program. It appears, however, that in the very near future this phenomenon will cease and the rights of clients will be one of the greatest concerns we will attend to in rehabilitation.

10. Up to this point, referring caseworkers have had to place their confidence in the vocational evaluation program. However, in many instances they found reason to question what they were getting for their money. Often recommendations from evaluation programs were very general in nature and of little value. Nadolsky (1971) sheds some light on this from his study as he concluded that vocational evaluators appear to "use and attach more value to techniques and procedures which provide a general understanding of a client's vocational assets and limitations, rather than those designed to uncover specific vocational abilities and deficiencies (p. 23)." He also found little follow-up activity on their part. It is no wonder counselors are confused about vocational evaluation programs. With the misunderstanding of what the evaluation can do, with the different philosophies and techniques, with little client involvement and follow-up, and the like, it is no wonder the current confusion and concerns exist.

11. A scientific approach is needed if vocational evaluation is going to have any degree of validity. As noted by Kerlinger (1967), "The scientific approach has one characteristic that no other method of attaining knowledge has: self-correction. There are built in checks all along the way to scientific knowledge (p. 7)." In a fine article, Walker (1970) warned vocational evaluation to take heed now and avoid

the pitfalls of many other related disciplines that he says have now become irrelevant because they fail to develop a feedback system which narrows the gap between what they are and what they ought to be (p. 39)."

12. Pruitt (1970) has made a fine attempt to develop a set of theoretical constructs by listing basic assumptions that he feels underlie work sample theory. This is one of the few attempts to do anything of this kind. Perhaps one reason for this is the negative connotation accorded theory by many rehabilitation personnel who profess allegiance to a "practical" armamentarium of tests, work samples, and real work. Thus, the evaluator approaches his job in an a priori way, i.e., assuming that what he is doing is reasonable and self-evident. However, the question can be posed as "According to whose reason?" Two evaluators, using supposedly rational processes, can reach different conclusions about a client, and they often do.

13. Besides Pruitt, there have been very few attempts in vocational evaluation to set forth a "set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions that present a systematic view of phenomenon "by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting the phenomenon" as theory is defined by Kerlinger (p. 11). Nadolsky (1966, 1971) has given some attention to this area, but the most comprehensive approach is the work done at the University of Minnesota by Dawis, Lofquist, and Weiss (1968) in developing and refining their Theory of Work Adjustment. The Minnesota Theory has attempted to meet the criteria set forth by Kerlinger. Although essentially a placement theory, it is also quite applicable to the study and operation of vocational evaluation programs (Brolin, 1973) and Browning, 1972). The model is too complicated to be reported here, and it is recommended that Dawis' (1967) article be read and/or copies of their monographs be obtained. The model focuses on the individual and his environment, with work adjustment dependent upon both satisfactoriness (ability to do the job satisfactorily), and satisfaction (client satisfaction with the job). A number of instruments have been developed to measure aspects of client personality and the work environment. This theoretical model has much to offer vocational evaluation.

CONCLUSION

14. The assessment of the validity of any vocational evaluation is contingent upon many assumptions. First, we assume the vocational evaluation program has competently trained personnel. Second, we assume that they have clearly specified the objectives of their program, have the proper components to do vocational evaluation, and are able to measure whether or not they have sufficiently met their objectives. Third, we assume the client has been sufficiently cooperative and motivated to display his vocational abilities and needs. Fourth, we assume that the persons who have rendered treatment (e.g., work adjustment, training, counseling, etc.) and job placement have performed those aspects competently. Fifth, we assume that the job the client is placed on has sufficiently met his basic needs and is something the person can do. And sixth, we assume that the client is able to manage his other activities-of-daily living and has the support of someone, like a family, during crisis periods.

15. Since the ultimate criterion of successful vocational evaluation, i.e., the congruence between predicted and actual client outcome, is so dependent on a multitude of factors beyond the evaluator's control, a more immediate assessment of its value appears warranted. The results of a vocational evaluation could be assessed immediately upon its completion by asking the opinions of counselors and other referring caseworkers, those who are to carry out the recommendations, and the client and his family, about their satisfaction with the program. Some examples of questions include: (a) Do you feel the recommendations are clear, specific enough, and realistic, and (b) Can the recommendations be implemented? Any questions answered "No" should be explained. The involvement of the client in evaluation planning should be ascertained.

16. The next point in assessing the validity of the vocational evaluation is during the treatment-training phase, either during and/or after its completion. At this point, questions can be posed of the training staff as to the correspondence between their findings and those of the evaluators in regard to client strengths, weaknesses, interests, and vocational training potentials. The realism of the recommendations can be evaluated further at this time. Client satisfaction of the congruence of the evaluation with the training program should be determined. After placement (or whatever happens next), periodic follow-up with client, family, and employer should be done to again ascertain how well the evaluation was able to be of assistance. This includes the extent to which other disciplines and agencies contributed toward carrying through the needed services.

17. The question of what really constitutes a good vocational evaluation is not an easy one. If we wait too long after an evaluation, too many extraneous variables and forgetting will operate to confound such an analysis. Thus, immediately following and periodic evaluations of the evaluation must be employed with the latter ones being less valid as time increases. It is questionable if vocational evaluators can really predict, with any degree of accuracy, most clients' future vocational potentials. We must come to the realization that there are so many influences on what one becomes, that our most important role is for short-range planning and re-evaluation as the clients develop new skills and horizons. Evaluators should re-enter the scene at many different points along the rehabilitation process rather than just at the beginning.

18. In summary, completely valid vocational assessment and prediction is extremely difficult. It consists of both short-term and long-term goals, the latter (what can he do in the future) being most difficult to ascertain. Vocational evaluation consists of both quantitative and clinical judgements. Besides the client, however, vocational outcome is also highly dependent on the interaction of many family, community, and agency variables. Neff (1970) has called attention to "the fact that human behavior is not only a function of the characteristics of persons, but also a function of the situations in which persons find themselves (p. 28)." It is time, therefore, for evaluators, work adjusters, placement specialists, counselors, administrators, educators, the clients, and their families to begin working more closely together so that client needs can be most adequately met.

19. We are entering into an era of accountability. Guidelines have been established for working relationships between vocational rehabilitation agencies and rehabilitation facilities. Accreditation is now being mandated and program evaluation greatly encouraged to insure a certain level of standards. Vocational evaluation is at a crucial stage in its development. Vocational evaluation personnel must meet this challenge by developing the methodology whereby their program's efficacy can be systematically and empirically validated.

DONN BROLIN

COMPREHENSIVE
BIBLIOGRAPHY

i.

- Allen, C., and Sax, A., Norms and Performance standards for work sample scores. Menomonie, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin - Stout, Development of Rehabilitation and Manpower Services, Materials Development Center, 1972.
- Arkansas Rehabilitation Research & Training Center, Orientation institute - evaluation for vocational potential. Hot Springs, Arkansas: Author, 1966.
- Barker, R., Ecological Psychology. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- Barton, E., The rehabilitation workshop and the foreman's role. San Francisco: University of San Francisco, 1971.
- Barton, E., Training material on work evaluation. Los Angeles: California State College, 1967.
- Barton, E., (Ed.), "The assessment of rehabilitation client feasibility," VEWA Bulletin, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 1972, pp. 26-34.
- International Labour Office, Vocational assessment and work conditioning, 11-16; Vocational training and retraining, 21-25. Basic principles of vocational rehabilitation of the disabled, Geneva, Switzerland: Author, 1970.
- Bennett, G.K., Factors affecting the value of validation studies. Personnel Psychology, 1969, 265-268.
- Bitter, J., Training guide for vocational habilitation. St. Louis: Jewish Employment and Vocational Service, 1966.
- Brandt, R., Studying behavior in natural settings. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972.
- Bregman, M., Some common components in vocational evaluation. Paper presented at the National Rehabilitation Association Annual Conference, New York, November, 1969.
- Bregman, M., The use and misuse of vocational evaluation in the counseling process. In University of Pittsburgh, Research and Training Center in Vocational Rehabilitation, Some recent advances and research in vocational evaluation. Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Author, 1967.
- Brolin, D., Vocational evaluation: Special education's responsibility. Education & Training of the Mentally Retarded, (February issue), 1973.
- Brolin, D., Appropriate use of rehabilitation facilities. Journal of Rehabilitation, (January-February issue), 1973.
- Brolin, D., The value of rehabilitation services and correlates of vocational success with the mentally retarded. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1972, 76, 6, 644-651.

- Brolin, D., and Wright, G.N., Implementing rehabilitation recommendations for the mentally retarded. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1971, 75, 5, 586-592.
- Browning, P., The work adjustment of the Mentally Retarded: A frame of reference for practice and research. Rehabilitation Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation, University of Oregon, Working Paper No. 59, April, 1972.
- Burge, W.G., The counselor-evaluator relationship: Its nature and effects. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1972, 5(2), 16-20.
- Button, W., and Miller, L., Case studies in the delivery of vocational rehabilitation services: Conceptual and empirical dimensions. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1972.
- Button, W., Kimberly, J., Lubow, B., and Kimberly, R., A conceptual framework for the analysis of work behavior in sheltered workshops. Studies in Behavior and Rehabilitation No. 1. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Region II Rehabilitation Research Institute, 1966.
- Campell, J., and O'Toole, R., Work adjustment: A dynamic rehabilitation process. Cleveland, Ohio: Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services, 1970.
- Campbell, J., Problems in defining work evaluation and work adjustment. In Stout State University, Vocational evaluation curriculum development workshop. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Author, 1967.
- Church, R., Staff recruitment, training and development associated with the delivery of vocational evaluation and work adjustment services: The Rehabilitation Services Administration. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in manpower, social welfare and rehabilitation programs. Washington, D.C.: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1970.
- Clark, D., Evaluation: A psychologist's view. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1969, 2(2), 3-6.
- Cobb, H., Predicting vocational adjustment in the mentally retarded. In Research and Training Center in Vocational Rehabilitation of the University of Pittsburgh, Some recent advances and research in vocational evaluation. Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Author, 1967.
- Couch, R.H., "Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment-A Profession?", Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1971, 4(3), 3-5.
- Cronbach, L.G., Test "Reliability": Its Meaning and Determination, Psychometrika, Vol. 12, 1, 1947, 1-15.
- Cubelli, G., Vocational evaluation with mentally ill clients. In W. Pruitt (Ed.), Readings in work evaluation - 1. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Stout State University, Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation, 1970.

- Cundiff, G., Henderson, S., and Little, N. (Eds.), Training guides in evaluation of vocational potential for vocational rehabilitation staff. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1965.
- Dauterman, W., Elementary considerations in evaluating the work abilities of disabled persons. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University, School of Medicine, 1964.
- Dawis, R., Lofquist, L., & Weiss, D., A theory of work adjustment (a revision). Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, Monograph XXIII, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1968.
- Dawis, R., The Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1967, 11, 1-10.
- Dawis, R., The Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment (a book of readings). Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University materials information center, 153-160.
- Dunn, D., Work Adjustment, Work Evaluation and Employability, Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1971, 4(2), 11-16.
- Dunn, D., Decision-making in work evaluation. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin--Stout, 1969.
- Dunn, D., Separating learning from performance in work evaluation. Informational Bulletin, Menomonie, Wisconsin: Stout State University, Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation, 1971, 3(2).
- Egerman, K., and Gilbert, J., The work evaluator. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1969, 35(3), 12-14.
- Ehrle, R., "Work" as an Alternative to "Words" in the Behavior Modification of Rehabilitation Clients. Paper read at the National Rehabilitation Association, Region III Conference, San Juan, Puerto Rico, June 4-8, 1967.
- Evaluation and Work Adjustment Services in Vocational Rehabilitation, 10th Institute on Rehabilitation Services (unpublished Preliminary Draft), 1972.
- Experimental Manpower Laboratory at Mobilization, Inc., The work sample: Reality-based assessment of vocational potential. New York: Author, n.d.
- Fagan, J., and Shepherd, I., Gestalt Therapy Now; Theory, Techniques, Application. Harper Colophon Books, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, 1970.
- Fischer, C., The testee as co-evaluator. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17(1), 70-76.

- Friend, E., The significance of the evaluatee-evaluator relationship. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1966, 9(4), 123-126. Also appears in R. Sankovsky, G. Arthur, & J. Mann (Comps.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment: A book of readings. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service, 1969.
- Gelfand, B., The concept of reality as used in work evaluation and work adjustment. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1966, 32(6), 26-28.
- Gellman, W., Research and demonstration projects and innovative approaches pertaining to vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in rehabilitation programs. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Services in Manpower, Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Programs, Washington, D.C.: I.A.R.F., 1970.
- Gellman, W., The principles of vocational evaluation. Rehabilitation Literature, 1968, 29(4), 98-102.
- Gellman, W., The obstacles within rehabilitation and how to overcome them. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1967, January - February, 41-44.
- Genskow, J.K., Vocational evaluation and client responsibility. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(3), 16-18.
- Goldenson, R.M., The Encyclopedia of Human Behavior: Psychology, Psychiatry, and Mental Health, Volume I, Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York, 1970.
- Gorthy, W., et. al., Vocational evaluation by work sample technic and its dependence upon medical contributions. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 1959, 40, 238-242.
- Gustad, J., "The evaluation interview in vocational counseling." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 36, 242-250.
- Halmos, P., The Personal Service Society: The sociology and social welfare series. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.
- Hardy R., & Cull, J., Standards in evaluation. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1969, 11(1), 11-13.
- Helfand, A., Vocational counseling in work evaluation of the cerebral palsied. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1960, 26(6), 5-6.
- Henryssen, S., Gathering, Analyzing, and using data on test items, in R.L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational Measurement, 2nd Edition, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Hoffman, P., "Work Evaluation: An overview" in Pruitt and Pacinelli (Eds.), Work Evaluation in Rehabilitation, Washington, D.C.: Association of Rehabilitation Centers, 1969.
- Hoffman, P., "Think tank" workshop on work evaluation. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Stout State University, Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation, 1969.

- Hoffman, P., As an educator sees the need to train work evaluators. In Stout State University, Vocational evaluation curriculum development workshop. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Author, 1967.
- Hoffman, P., Work evaluation & work adjustment. In P. Affleck, F. DeCapot, & J. Szufnarowki (Eds.), Proceedings of Short Term Training Institute on Work Adjustment-Vocational Evaluation Services. Hyannis, Massachusetts: Massachusetts and Connecticut Associations of Sheltered Workshops and Homebound Programs, 1969.
- Hunt, J., Social welfare programs and vocational evaluation and work adjustment services. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in manpower, social welfare and rehabilitation programs. Pittsburgh: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1970, 29-36.
- International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. Special Report. New Dimensions in Training Rehabilitation Facility Personnel. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Services, 1972-1.
- Jewish Employment and Vocational Service, Work samples: Signposts on the road to occupational choice. Philadelphia: Author, 1968.
- Jewish Vocational Service, Learning by Doing, final report. Chicago: Author, 1971.
- Jewish Vocational Service, Observation and Client Evaluation in Workshops, a Guide and a Manual, Research Utilization Laboratory, Chicago: Project No. 22-P-55182, 1972.
- Johnston, L., The counselor as he really is. In C. Patterson (Ed.), Readings in Rehabilitation Counseling, Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1960.
- Journal of Rehabilitation, Colloquy on Work Evaluation, January-February, 1970, 36(1).
- Kerlinger, F., Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Klapper, M., Disciplines vary in vocational evaluation. Rehabilitation Record, 1965, 6(4), 22-25.
- Koffka, K., Principles of Gestalt Psychology, Chapters V, VI, VIII, IX, Harbinger Books, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York, New York, 1963.
- Koran, S., Performance Testing In Public Personnel Selection, Part II, Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1, 4, 1941, 365-386.
- Knowles, R., & Shah, G., Cultural Bias in Testing: An Exploration, The Journal of Social Psychology, 1969, 77, 285-286.

- Krantz, G., Vocational evaluation in the public schools. In W. Pruitt (Ed.), Readings in work evaluation - I. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Stout State University, Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation, 1970.
- Kulman, H., Drachman, F., New developments in the Philadelphia JEVS work sample system, Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, (in press).
- Lawlis, F., Ratings of interpersonal skills. Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center Discussion Papers, University of Arkansas, 1971.
- LeCompte, W., The taxonomy of a treatment environment. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 1972, 53, 109-114.
- Linn, R., Range Restriction Problems In The Use Of Self-Selected Groups For Test Validation, Psychological Bulletin, 1968, Vol. 69, 1, 69-73.
- Little, N. (Ed.), Guidelines for organization and operation of vocational evaluation units: Report No. 2 of the study committee on evaluation of vocational potential. Rehabilitation Services Series No. 67-50. Fourth Institute on Rehabilitation Services, Chicago: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966.
- Lovell, M., Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in manpower programs. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in manpower, social welfare and rehabilitation programs. Washington, D.C.: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1970.
- Lustig, P., The Clinical Use of Work Flow Relationships, Madison, University of Wisconsin, 1965.
- Lustig, P., Differential use of the work situation in the sheltered workshop. Rehabilitation Literature, 1970, 31, 39-42.
- Lustig, P., Personal qualifications and training programs work evaluators. Regional Pilot Institute on Work Evaluators, Edited by Auburn University, Alabama: Auburn University, 1961.
- McAlees, D., Evaluation of job readiness. Paper presented at Placement Institute, Oklahoma State University, 1965.
- McClarnon, K., Special problems in work evaluation with the public offender. In W. Pruitt (Ed.), Readings in work evaluation - I. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Stout State University, Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation, 1970.
- McGowan, J., Referral, evaluation and treatment. In Malikin, K. and Rusalem, H. (Ed.), In Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled - An Overview, New York, 1969, 111-127.
- Means, B., Evaluation in the vocational rehabilitation setting viewed as a correlate of brave new world. Rehabilitation Research and Practice Review, 1971, 3(1), 17-19.

- Meehl, P., Clinical versus Statistical Prediction, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.
- Meehl, P., Clinical versus Statistical Prediction, A theoretical analysis and review of the evidence, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.
- Mercer, S., "Generic Vocational Evaluator Competencies." An unpublished study. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, 1973.
- Messenger, S., ". . . love . . . empathic rather than paternalistic," Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 3, July-September, 1969.
- Miller, D., Kuncze, J., & Getsinger, S., Prediction of job success for clients with hearing loss. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1972, 16, 1, 21-28.
- Miller, M., Work evaluation manual for Goodwill Industries. Washington: Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., 1968.
- Moed, M., Klinecicz, W., & Usdane, W., Who is the prevocational evaluator? Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1957, 5, 161-164.
- Muthard, J. (Ed.), Proceedings of the Iowa conference on pre-vocational activities. Iowa City, Iowa: State University of Iowa, 1960.
- Nadolsky, J., Patterns of consistency among vocational evaluators. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1971, 4(4), 13-25.
- Nadolsky, J., Development of a Model for Vocational Evaluation of the Disadvantaged. Auburn University, Research Grant No. 12-55140/4-01 Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Auburn, Alabama, 1971.
- Nadolsky, J., Evaluation criteria: An essential precursor to systematic vocational evaluation. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1966, 9(3), 89-93. Also appears in R. Sankovsky, G. Arthur, & J. Mann (Comps.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment: A book of readings. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service, 1969.
- Neff, W., Problems of work evaluation. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44(7), 682-688. Also appears in R. Sankovsky, G. Arthur, & J. Mann (Comps.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment: A book of readings. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service, 1969.
- Neff, W., The assessment of work potential. In Work and human behavior. New York: Atherton Press, 1968, pp. 169-182.
- Neff, W., Vocational assessment - theory and models. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 27-29.
- Neff, W., Rehabilitation and work. In Neff, W. (Ed.), Rehabilitation psychology. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1971.

- Neff, W., The success of a rehabilitation program: A follow-up study of clients of the Vocational Adjustment Center. Jewish Vocational Service Monograph 3, Chicago: The Jewish Vocational Service, 1960.
- Neubauer, G., Vocational Education, Issues, Problems, Resources and Services Needed, and Joint Agency Planning and Programming for the Disabled and Mentally and/or Physically Handicapped Persons. Vocational Education and Rehabilitation of the Disabled and Disadvantaged. R. Dean Taylor & B. Thomason, (Ed.), Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida College of Health Related Professions, Department of Rehabilitation Counseling, 1970, 29-46.
- Olshansky, S., Client as decision maker. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 3, July-September, 1969, pp.4-6.
- Olson, I., Pre-vocational evaluation through assignment to work relief. In G. Krantz (Ed.), Conference on prevocational evaluation. Minneapolis: Minneapolis Public Schools, 1963.
- Overs, R., Vocational evaluation: Research and implications. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 18-21.
- Overs, R., Evaluation for work by job sample tasks. Cleveland: Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services, 1964.
- Overs, R., & Cole, E., "Work Evaluation". In R. Sankovsky, G. Arthur, & J. Mann (Comps.), Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment: A book of readings. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service, 1969.
- Pacinelli, R. (Ed.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in manpower, social welfare, and rehabilitation programs. Washington, D.C.: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1970.
- Pearls, F., Gestalt Theory Verbatim, Real People Press, 1969.
- Peter, L., Individual instruction. New York: McGraw Hill, 1972.
- Phelps, W., Out of the Shadows: A program of evaluation and prevocational training for mentally retarded young adult females. West Virginia Rehabilitation Center: Charleston, West Virginia, 1965.
- Pruitt, W., Situational assessment: Principles and process. Unpublished paper. University of Wisconsin--Stout, Menomonie, Wisconsin, 1971.
- Pruitt, W., Basic assumptions underlying work sample theory. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 24-26.
- Pruitt, W., & Pacinelli, R. (Ed.), Work evaluation in rehabilitation. Washington, D.C.: Association of Rehabilitation Centers, 1969.
- Pruitt, W., Task Analysis of the Vocational Rehabilitation Graduate Majors with an emphasis in Work Evaluation: A comparative study of two groups of work evaluators, unpublished manuscript, October, 1972.

Puth, A., Increasing relationalism among specialized systems of knowledge or understanding. Chapter VI in Report of a Study of Basic Questions in Rehabilitation, National Rehabilitation Association, Washington, D.C., 1972.

Pedkey, H., & White, B., The prevocational unit in a rehabilitation center - an effective tool for evaluating work potential of the handicapped. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1956.

Rehabilitation Record, Making Research work for disabled people. November-December, 1969.

Rice, B., Considerations for Improved Counselor-Evaluator Relationships. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1972, 5(4), in press.

Rice, B., Prescriptive vocational evaluation. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1972, 5(1), 8-11.

Roberts, C., Definitions, objectives, and goals in work evaluation. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 12-15. Also appears in R. Sankovsky, G. Arthur, & J. Mann (Comps.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment: A book of readings. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service, 1969.

Rosenberg, B., Role of the evaluator in a rehabilitation center. In Stout State University, Vocational evaluation curriculum development workshop. Menomonee, Wisconsin: Author, 1967.

Rosenberg, B., The professional in vocational evaluation. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 30-32.

Rosenberg, B., Job evaluation through the "TOWER" work sample approach. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Research utilization in rehabilitation facilities. Washington, D.C.: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1971.

Ross, D., Conceptual model of a professional evaluator. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Research utilization in rehabilitation facilities. Washington, D.C.: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1971.

Ryans, D., and Frederiksen, Performance Tests of Educational Achievement, from E. Lindquist (Ed.), Educational Measurement. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1951.

Salter, K., Similarities of Vocational Evaluation and Gestalt Psychology, unpublished paper, Vocational Evaluation Training Program, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, 1972.

Sankovsky, R., Rehabilitation counselor training programs and the vocational assessment process. In Research and Training Center in Vocational Rehabilitation, SAME, Johnstown, Pennsylvania, 1969.

Sankovsky, R., Patterns of services in vocational evaluation. In W. Pruitt, & R. Pacinelli (Eds.), Work evaluation in rehabilitation. Washington, D.C.: Association of Rehabilitation Centers, 1969, 33-34.

Sankovksy, R., State of the art in Vocational evaluation: Report of a national survey. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Research and Training Center in Vocational Rehabilitation (RT-14), 1969.

Sankovsky, R., Toward a common understanding of vocational evaluation. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 10-12.

Sankovsky, R., Characteristics of the VEWAA Membership: 1971. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1971, 4(2), 17-26.

Shontz, F., Behavior settings may affect rehabilitation client. Rehabilitation Record, 1967, 8(2), 37-40.

Smith, D., Closing the manpower gap in vocational evaluation. In W. Pruitt, & R. Pacinelli (Eds.), Work evaluation in rehabilitation. Washington, D.C.: Association of Rehabilitation Centers, 1969, 103-108.

Spergel, P., Vocational evaluation: Research and implications for maximizing human potential. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 21-24.

Spergel, P., & Leshner, S., Vocational assessment through work sampling. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 1968, 44, 225-229.

Speiser, A., The professional in vocational evaluation. In W. Pruitt (Ed.), Readings in work evaluation - I. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Stout State University, Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation, 1970.

Stone, T., Sources of evaluator bias in performance appraisal. Experimental Publication System, 1970, 8, Manuscript No. 290-312.

Stout, J., Certifying the evaluator. Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin, 1969, 2(4), 4-6. Also paper at the National Rehabilitation Association Annual Conference in New York City, November 3, 1969.

Study Group on Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Services, Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in vocational rehabilitation. Final draft from the Tenth Institute on Rehabilitation Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota: May 15-17, 1972.

Suazo, T., Purposes and scope of evaluation. In P. Lustig, Evaluation Methods in the Workshop. Proceedings of the Institute for Sheltered Workshop Administrators and Supervisors, University of Wisconsin, Madison, June 29-30, 1964, 4-7.

Taylor, R., A model for service delivery. Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, 1970, p. 68.

Therapeutic Psychology, Brammer & Shostrom, 1965.

Thompson, N. (Ed.), The Role of the Workshop in Rehabilitation, National Institute on the Role of the Workshop in Rehabilitation, 1958.

Torrey, E., What Western psychoterapists can learn from Witchdoctors. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 42(11), 69-76, January, 1972.

Townsend, O., A vocational rehabilitation setting and the black client - as seen by a black evaluator. In L. Miller (Ed.), Rehabilitation facilities as resources for rehabilitation counselors. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1970, pp. 163-166.

Truelson, A., Research and demonstration projects and innovative approaches pertaining to vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in social welfare programs. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in manpower, social welfare and rehabilitation programs. Pittsburgh: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1970, 77-86.

University of Pittsburgh, Research and Training Center in Vocational Rehabilitation, State of the Art in Vocational Evaluation: Report of a National Survey, Pittsburgh, Author, 1969.

U.S. Department of Labor, Handbook for Analyzing Jobs, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Walker, R., A future for vocational evaluation. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1970, 36(1), 38-39.

Walker, R., The accountability game. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1971, 37(4), 34-36.

Watkins, A., Prevocational evaluation and rehabilitation in a general hospital. Journal of the American Medical Association, 1959, 171, 385-388.

Whitehouse, F., Client evaluation in the habilitation process. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1953, 19(6), 4-6. Also appears in R. Sankovsky, G. Arthur, & J. Mann (Comps.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment: A book of readings. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service, 1969.

Whitten, E., NRS views vocational evaluation and work adjustment services. In R. Pacinelli (Ed.), Vocational evaluation and work adjustment services in manpower, social welfare and rehabilitation programs. Pittsburgh: International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, 1970, 49-55.

Williamson, D., Why work samples? Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1961, 4, 123-126.

Work evaluation: An annotated bibliography, 1947-1970. Menomonie, Wisconsin: Stout State University, Department of Rehabilitation and Manpower Services, 1971.

Wright, G., Reagles, K. & Butler, A., An Expanded Program of Vocational Rehabilitation Methodology and Description of Client Population. Wisconsin Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation Monograph XI, Series 2, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1970.

Wright, M., Advocacy: A new rehabilitation role function. Psychological Aspects of Disability, 18(2), 89-90, July, 1971.

xii.

Yue, S., & Moed, M., Medical and vocational evaluation of young adult cerebral palsied: Experience and follow-up, 157 cases. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 1960, 41, 136-142.